CANADIAN THESES ON MICROFICHE

THÈSES CANADIENNES SUR MICROFICHE

National Library of Canada
Collections Development Branch

Canadian Theses on
Microfiche Service

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada
Direction du développement des collections

Service des thèses canadiennes
sur microfiche

NOTICE

The quality of this microfiche is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Previously copyrighted materials (journal articles, published tests, etc.) are not filmed.

Reproduction in full or in part of this film is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30. Please read the authorization forms which accompany this thesis.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microfiche dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

Les documents qui font déjà l'objet d'un droit d'auteur (articles de revue, examens publiés, etc.) ne sont pas microfilmés.

La reproduction, même partielle, de ce microfilm est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30. Veuillez prendre connaissance des formules d'autorisation qui accompagnent cette thèse.

THIS DISSERTATION HAS BEEN MICROFILMED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED

LA THÈSE A ÉTÉ MICROFILMÉE TELLE QUE NOUS L'AVONS REÇUE

Canada

NL 339 (r. 86/09)

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

UNDERSTANDING THE MEANING OF TEACHER COMPETENCE: AN INTERPRETIVE STUDY OF A TEACHER EDUCATION CURRICULUM IN KOREA

by

SOOK HUR

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE

OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF SECONDARY EDUCATION

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

FALL, 1986

Permission has been granted to the National Library of Canada to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film.

The author (copyright owner) has reserved other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her written permission.

L'autorisation a été accordée à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de microfilmer cette thèse et de prêter ou de vendre des exemplaires du film.

L'auteur (titulaire du droit d'auteur) se réserve les autres droits de publication; ni la thèse ni de longs extraits de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation écrite.

ISBN 0-315-32598-4

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

RELEASE FORM

NAME OF AUTHOR SOOK HUR

TITLE OF THESIS UNDERSTANDING THE MEANING OF TEACHER COMPETENCE: AN INTERPRETIVE STUDY OF A TEACHER EDUCATION CURRICULUM IN KOREA

DEGREE FOR WHICH THESIS WAS PRESENTED DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

YEAR THIS DEGREE GRANTED FALL, 1986

Permission is hereby granted to THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA LIBRARY to reproduce single copies of this thesis and to lend or sell such copies for private, scholarly or scientific research purposes only.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

(SIGNED) Hur Sook

PERMANENT ADDRESS:

Department of Education

Incheon Teachers College

Incheon, Korea

DATED June 07, 1986

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH, for acceptance, a thesis entitled UNDERSTANDING THE MEANING OF TEACHER COMPETENCE: AN INTERPRETIVE STUDY OF A TEACHER EDUCATION CURRICULUM IN KOREA submitted by SOOK HUR in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY.

.....

Supervisor

.....

.....

.....

Edmund C. Short

.....

External Examiner

Date...June 07, 1986.....

ABSTRACT

This study seeks to understand the meaning of teacher competence through an interpretation of a teacher education curriculum in Korea. As a reflective endeavor to make sense of what we are doing in educating teachers, the study seeks a deeper understanding of the meaning of teacher competence rather than facts or solutions to concrete problems. It stands on a hope that important improvements in teacher education can come about by an effort to understand what the term "teacher competence" really means.

As a way of problematizing our taken-for-granted thinking and acting in educating teachers, the study begins with a critical examination of the dominant orientations in contemporary understandings of teacher competence. Recognizing that much of recent research and practice in teacher education is rationally and technologically oriented, the study calls into question the fundamental beliefs and assumptions embedded in the scientific-technological understanding of teacher competence.

In responding to charges of the narrowness and mindlessness of the scientific-technological understanding, the study introduces the hermeneutical tradition as a way of coming to a deeper understanding of teacher competence. Influenced by the philosophical hermeneutics of Hans-Georg Gadamer, the study sees that all human understanding is prejudiced and language-bound, and that true understanding

has ontological rather than epistemological basis. It believes that the broadening and deepening of our horizons of understanding are possible through a hermeneutical interpretation of a "text" which is in nature a constant self-reflective effort.

Guided by the notion of "concreteness," the study selects a series of teacher education curriculum texts, and tries to interpret them in order to reveal the texts' understanding of teacher competence, to disclose the concealed meaning in the language of the texts, and thus to come to a deeper understanding of what the term "teacher competence" really means. The study reveals the texts' understanding of teacher competence in terms of four basic themes: instrumental understanding of education, bureaucratic understanding of curriculum, technical conceptualization of teaching, and objectification of human knowing.

The latter part of the study reflects upon its own journey of inquiry as a way of deepening our understanding of teacher competence. By bringing the technological understanding into an extended criticism, the reflection tries to open new dimensions of questioning in our infinite process of inquiry into the meaning of teacher competence. Reflections upon the personal experience of understanding in this study are followed by an inconclusive conclusion.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to express my sincere appreciation, firstly and foremost, to my supervisor, Dr. Ted Aoki, for his enthusiastic advice and inspiration throughout my doctoral studies. I am both personally and professionally deeply indebted to him for his support and encouragement.

I am also grateful to the other members of the supervisory committee, Dr. K. Jacknicke and Dr. T. Carson. Their enlightening comments and suggestions have contributed immensely to this study.

I wish to extend special thanks to Dr. J. Blakey of the Department of Elementary Education, University of Alberta, and Dr. Edmund Short of Pennsylvania State University for their incisive comments and questions on the dissertation.

I wish to acknowledge my fellow graduate students who helped me along the way of this study by providing many ideas for discussion. I wish to give thanks to Virginia Sauve, Lise Maisonneuve, Stephen Bath, Mikio Fujita, and my long-time friend Mahn-Seug Oh.

The completion of this study cannot compensate for the love and sacrifice that have fortified and sustained me throughout the period of my study. To my mother, my wife Eun-Bok, my son Ju, my daughter Eun, I offer my deepest thanks for their patience, tolerance and understanding.

Table of Contents

Chapter — Page

I. INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY 1

A. Twofold Context of the Study 1

Personal context 1

Theoretical Context 4

B. Statement of Purpose and Research Questions 8

Purpose of the Study 8

Research Questions 8

C. Research Approach 9

D. The Organization of the Study 10

II. CONTEMPORARY UNDERSTANDINGS OF TEACHER COMPETENCE: THE DOMINANT PARADIGM 13

A. Introduction 13

B. Historical Perspectives 15

Traditional Heritages 15

Liberal and Technical: The Age-Old Controversy 17

The Rise of Scientific Teacher Education 21

C. The Dominant Paradigm in Understanding Teacher Competence 25

The Field of Curriculum 25

CBTE: An Example of Technological Teacher Education 33

Technological Framework for Teacher Competence 35

D. Making the Dominant Understanding Problematic ..43

III. SEARCHING FOR A WAY OF DEEPER UNDERSTANDING 47

A. Introduction 47

B. The Tradition of Hermeneutics 49

The Origin of Hermeneutics 49

Schleiermacher's General Hermeneutics 51

Dilthey's Historical Hermeneutics 53

Heidegger's Ontological Hermeneutics 56

C. Gadamer's Philosophical Hermeneutics 60

Hermeneutics as a Philosophy of Understanding 60

Understanding and Prejudice 62

Understanding and Language 65

The Function of Hermeneutical Reflection 68

D. Considerations for the Research Approach 73

Hermeneutical Questioning 74

Hermeneutical Circle 76

Hermeneutical Application 79

Translation and Interpretation 80

IV. THE INSTITUTIONAL AND CURRICULAR CONTEXTS OF THE TEXTS 83

A. Introduction 83

B. The Curriculum Documents as Text 84

C. The Institutional Context 87

D. The Curricular Context 92

V. INTERPRETING THE TEXTS OF A TEACHER EDUCATION CURRICULUM 98

A. Introduction 98

B. Revealing Interpretive Questions 101

C. Understanding the Meaning of Teacher Competence 106

Instrumental Understanding of Education and Teacher Competence 106

Bureaucratic Understanding of Curriculum and Teacher Competence 116

Technical Conceptualization of Teaching and Teacher Competence 127

Objectification of Human Knowing and Teacher Competence 137

D. Initial Reflection: Revealing Underlying Preconceptions 149

Underlying Preconceptions 149

Searching for a Deeper Understanding 154

VI. REFLECTING ON THE MEANING OF TEACHER COMPETENCE ..156

A. At the Reflective Moment of the Study 156

B. What We Have Lost in Technological Understanding 158

We are losing humane language in our educational discourse. 160

We are losing personal meanings in our educational experiences. 162

We are losing humanity in our human education. 165

C. Re-questioning the Meaning of Teacher Competence 167

The teacher is a human being. 168

Human being is the whole person. 171

Competence is communal venturing. 173

D. Reflections on the Personal Experience of Understanding 175

E. Inconclusive Conclusion: Teacher or Educator? .179

BIBLIOGRAPHY 183

List of Tables

Table	Page
Table 1. Institutions for Teacher Education	91
Table 2. Credit Allotment for Secondary School Teacher Education	94
Table 3. Credit Allotment for Elementary School Teacher Education (2 year program)	94
Table 4. Credit Allotment for Elementary School Teacher Education (4 year program)	95

Chapter I

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

A. Twofold Context of the Study

Personal context

This study emerges from my experiences in educating teachers. Before I entered my doctoral studies program, I was a teacher educator at a teacher education institution in Korea, where I taught student teachers about teaching in a course named "curriculum and instruction." Teaching student teachers was exciting for me as it allowed me to be involved in the transition of young men and women from being students on a college campus to becoming full-fledged teachers in schools. It was a distinct pleasure to mingle with prospective teachers when they came into my office to talk about teaching and the teaching profession.

Since our natural tendency, as ordinary people caught in a particular "language web" (Huebner, 1975a, p.252), is to defend and to promote what we are doing rather than to find faults in it, the opportunity for a teacher to reflect critically on what s/he is doing is indeed rare. Certainly, this was my case. I was enthusiastic at that time in talking with my students about some theories of curriculum and teaching without considering seriously the intentions and assumptions which are embedded in the language the theories use. I was eager to identify and talk about the knowledge

and skills prospective teachers are expected to know to teach children without considering what they really mean in my situation as well as in my students' situation.

After several years in the classroom with student teachers, two events threw me into confusion. First, when I met the teachers whom I had taught, some of them complained with one voice that the real classroom work is much different from the stories they were told in the college classroom. They often said:

> "Teaching theories in the textbooks are hollow words."
>
> "The good teacher in the classroom differs from the good teacher in the textbooks."

From conversations with the teachers, I had a strong feeling that something was wrong, and the feeling urged me to re-think about what I was doing.

Secondly, in 1980, there was a governmental decision in Korea concerning the reformation of teacher education which included a plan to raise the status of teachers' colleges' from a two-year junior college level to a four-year university education. In the process of meeting with this important change, particularly in terms of curricular reorganization, the teacher educators could have a chance to exchange their views on teacher education. The uneasiness of teacher education was reflected in the almost endless discussions of what ought to be taught or required of teachers, in unceasing dialogue about the meaning of

---

[1] The distinction between teachers' colleges and colleges of education in Korea is discussed in chapter IV.

teaching and of competence in teaching. Struck by the predominance of technical and mechanical understanding of teacher education in our conversations, however, I found myself becoming aware that we need to reflect seriously on our lived world of teacher education.

Standing back and away from the classroom, which was afforded by a study leave, has provided me the opportunity to reflect again on what I was doing. A unique graduate program offered by the Department of Secondary Education at the University of Alberta has enabled me to realize that more fundamental questions are possible, the questions about what the term "teacher competence" really means and whether its use in the context of teacher education is appropriate.

In any society, the immutable purpose of teacher education is to cultivate "good" or "competent" teachers. In the Korean Educational Act, for example, one will read that the purpose of teacher education is to cultivate teachers who have "fine character," "sound ideas," and "strong educational convictions," but missing is a portrayal of what those terms mean. Hence, every teacher educator, justly or unjustly, is making an effort to cultivate "competent" teachers in accordance with his or her understanding of the meaning of teacher competence.

There is little discussion today as to what direction the teacher education in Korea is taking, and what assumptions and intentions are implicit in the term "teacher competence" we use in educating teachers. We teacher

educators, as I see it, need to reflect and re-think seriously the past and present of teacher education, and come to know the not yet. In this context, this study will be a personal struggle to break out of the shell surrounding me in an endeavor to become a better teacher of teachers.

Theoretical Context

Although the study of teacher education has not been an established area in the field of educational research, there have been numerous efforts by educational scholars and teacher educators to improve teacher education practice. The commitment to improvement is evident in the language we use, the time we spend, and experiences we share with others. Introducing new courses, extending the classroom practicum or developing some alternative forms of teacher education are reflective of various beliefs of what should happen in the preparation of teachers.

However, most research efforts aimed at improving teacher education have attempted, explicitly or implicitly, to answer the question of what the good or competent teacher is. It is evident in the controversies and debates in the history of teacher education over the ways in which this question is answered, and teachers should be prepared. Borrowman (1956) writes in his historical survey of American teacher education:

> That some are born great teachers has never been gainsaid. By 1953 [until now] American teacher educators had tried for over a century to capture elements of that greatness and, through disciplined

> intelligence and instruction, to reproduce these elements in increasing numbers of teachers. This age-old quest for a discipline of education has been marked by conflicts, false starts, and disappointments.... So it is with teacher education. (p.228)

In the process of trying to answer the question of what the good teacher is, and to develop a better form of teacher education, educational scholars have sought stylish terms, or have jargonized everyday words to describe their intentions and interests, regardless of what that practice actually is. This has been the case with the term "teacher competence."

A group of researchers have used this term to refer to specific and observable traits of the teacher which are assumed to be related to students' learning outcomes such as high achievement and favorable attitude using such terms as "teacher effectiveness", "competency-based teacher education" or "minimum-competency testing." The operative belief here is that "competence" in teaching is the teacher's proficiency in demonstrating his or her mastery of a welter of specialized techniques, skills and dispositions that will facilitate students' learning in any educational setting.

On the basis of this assumption, research on teacher competence would have to be directed toward identifying those qualities, characteristics, and behaviors that have been assumed to bring efficient results. A massive research effort has been actually undertaken in the last several decades with this ultimate practical aim of developing a

teacher education program. But, in spite of literally thousands of studies they have conducted and the hundreds of behavioral characteristics of a "competent" teacher they have identified, still it is difficult to say what the competent teacher is (Short, 1984, p.v).

However, the real problem is not the fact that we do not know what the competent teacher is, but rather the fact that there has been a tendency to totalize ways of understanding teacher competence into a single way, the instrumental way (Aoki, 1984a, p.71), and that the tendency prevails in the contemporary field of teacher education. Too often, debates in teacher education have been carried out within the parameters of a single orientation while seeing teacher competence as means to given ends and outcomes, and as skills and techniques. Huebner's (1975b) warning seems to be appropriate at this time:

> Today's curricular language seems filled with dangerous nonrecognized myths; dangerous not because they are myths, but because they remain nonrecognized and unchallenged.... Such curricular language must be continually questioned, its effectiveness challenged, its inconsistencies pointed out, its flaws exposed, and its presumed beauty denied. (p.218)

In the past decade a new criticism has become increasingly evident in the professional literature dealing with schooling in general, and school curriculum in particular. Although its names have varied, the term "reconceptualists" (Pinar, 1975a) has been used in the field. Reconceptualist thinking is significant for the reason that the questions asked, and the approaches pursued

to answer the questions break dramatically from the conventional mode of educational thinking. As a critical movement, it situates our thinking of curriculum and schooling in the nexus of individual, historical and cultural factors, and thus requires us to think educational problems beyond what has been taken for granted in our everyday commitments. Greene (1978) sees the necessity of challenging what is taken for granted in order to build a new pedagogy:

> The crucial problem, I believe, is the problem of challenging what is taken for granted and transmitted as taken-for-granted: ideas of hierarchy, of deserved deficits, of delayed gratification, and of mechanical time schemes in tension with inner time. A new pedagogy is obviously required, one that will free persons to understand the ways in which each of them reaches out from his or her location to constitute a common continent, a common world. (p.70)

If I have a motive for this study, it is in the belief that the field of teacher education also needs to be reconceptualized; the meaning of teacher competence used in teacher education needs to be re-understood and the practices related to it re-thought. To question the meaning of teacher competence, and deepen our understanding of it, this study will be directed toward an interpretive understanding of a teacher education curriculum in Korea. Concern is not to debunk the plans and efforts of those involved in teacher education, but rather to get some sort of authentic understanding of what we are doing under the the term "teacher competence." Wilson (1975) states:

> As with educational theory, the only honest attitude towards the preparation of teachers at present is something like: We're not clear what we ought to do, and we had better try to get clear. (p.12)

An endeavor to become more clear of who we are and what we are doing, it is believed, can aid us to come to a deeper understanding of what the term "teacher competence" really means, and the understanding in turn can help us in developing a better form of teacher education through increasing awareness of the fundamental beliefs and assumptions that determine our everyday thinking, doing and being in educating teachers.

B. Statement of Purpose and Research Questions

Purpose of the Study

The major purpose of this study is to come to a deeper understanding of the meaning of teacher competence by interpreting a series of teacher education curriculum texts in Korea. Through this process, an attempt also will be made to understand the current situation of Korean teacher education.

Research Questions

The following questions will provide the initial thrust for discussion in this study.

1. What are the predominant orientations in contemporary understandings of teacher competence?
2. How have these dominant ways of understanding been

established in contemporary teacher education?

3. What problems and limitations are there in these predominant ways of understanding?
4. What is the nature of hermeneutical understanding?
5. How can we reach a better understanding of teacher competence through a hermeneutical interpretation of a text?
6. How is the meaning of teacher competence understood in a teacher education curriculum in Korea?
7. What are the normally hidden beliefs and rationalities within which the meaning of teacher competence is understood in that way?
8. How should the meaning of teacher competence be understood?

C. Research Approach

As an inquiry into the meaning of teacher competence, this study is mainly concerned with the act of "understanding meaning" rather than "finding fact." The study does not intend to provide solutions, suggestions or recommendations to any concrete problem in teacher education. Rather, one is called upon to re-think personal values, experiences, and tacit knowledge. The study is based upon an assumption that a really important improvement in teacher education will come about only by an effort to understand it.

In an understanding that an attempt to understand the meaning of teacher competence must be a form of inquiry in which the act of human understanding itself becomes problematic, the research approach of the study will be based upon an interpretation of hermeneutics, mainly upon Hans-Georg Gadamer's notion of philosophical hermeneutics.

What is hermeneutical understanding? How is the nature of human understanding viewed in hermeneutics? How is a deeper understanding of teacher competence possible through a hermeneutical interpretation of teacher education curriculum texts? These questions are so crucial to this study not only in terms of the research approach but also for the philosophical background upon which this study is based, that I will discuss the above questions in a separate chapter (chapter III).

D. The Organization of the Study

The study is divided into six chapters. The first chapter has introduced the study through a brief discussion as to the significance of the study in both personal and theoretical contexts, and has provided the reader with the rationale and the importance of the study. This was then followed by a statement of purpose, research questions, and a brief introduction to the research approach.

Chapter II addresses some preliminary questions for the study: What are the predominant orientations in contemporary understandings of teacher competence? Are those

understandings really appropriate and fruitful in the context of teacher education? As a way of problematizing the current situation, the chapter examines the scientific-technological understanding of teacher competence as a dominant paradigm in contemporary fields of curriculum and teacher education. The chapter is intended to serve as a critical basis for coming to a deeper understanding of teacher competence.

In chapter III, contemporary hermeneutics is investigated to explore how a hermeneutical interpretation of a text makes it possible for us to reach a deeper understanding of meaning. The chapter has three parts. It begins with a brief review of the hermeneutical tradition by sketching some central figures in its development. The second part investigates the notion of Gadamer's philosophical hermeneutics by concentrating upon his main works, Truth and Method and Philosophical Hermeneutics. The last part considers hermeneutics in terms of its implications for the research approach of this study.

Chapter IV is designed to set out briefly historical and situational contexts in which is placed the teacher education curriculum to be understood in this study. After giving a list of the curriculum documents selected for the interpretation in this study, a portrayal of the institutional and the curricular context of Korean teacher education is provided.

In chapter V, the study enters into the concrete world of the curriculum texts in order to seek a deeper understanding of teacher competence. The chapter tries to reveal the texts' understanding of teacher competence by questioning the meanings of four basic conceptions in teacher education: education, curriculum, teaching, and human knowing. Throughout the interpretation, an endeavor to keep the dialogue between the texts and the interpreter is retained, in order to disclose the concealed meaning in the language of the texts, and thus come to a deeper understanding of what the term teacher competence really means. At the last part of the chapter, an initial reflection on the interpretation of the texts tries to reveal the hidden rationalities embedded in the texts' understanding of teacher competence.

Chapter VI reflects upon the study as a way of broadening and deepening our understanding. Understanding that hermeneutical reflection must be an opening to a new dimension of questioning, the chapter brings again the scientific-technological understanding into an extended criticism, and then tries to deepen our understanding by re-questioning the meaning of teacher competence. As the last chapter, it intends to open a new world for inquiries into the meaning of teacher competence, rather than to close the study.

Chapter II

CONTEMPORARY UNDERSTANDINGS OF TEACHER COMPETENCE: THE DOMINANT PARADIGM

A. Introduction

To clarify the purpose of the study, it may be necessary to ask some preliminary questions: Where are we now in our thinking about teacher competence? What are the predominant orientations in contemporary understandings of teacher competence? Are these understandings really appropriate and fruitful in the context of education?

As a way of answering these questions, this chapter seeks to understand the ways in which teacher competence is understood in contemporary research and practice of teacher education. Although a brief review of the literature shows a variety of ways of framing alternative conceptions of teacher competence, the search will focus on the state of much of the field, because the chapter is intended to provide a framework for criticism rather than to categorize theoretically efforts in teacher education.

The models of both research and practice in teacher education today tend to be limited in scope and are too closely tied to a few orientations that are dominant at this particular moment in time. Recognizing that much of recent research and practice in teacher education is rationally and technologically oriented, emphasis will be given to the analysis and critique of the dominant mode of understanding,

the scientific-technological understanding.

Since there are many variations in a mode of understanding according to their different foci of attention, the concept of paradigm can be useful in thinking about the dominant conceptualizations of teacher competence. A paradigm can be thought of as a matrix of beliefs, patterns of conduct, and bodies of knowledge which the members of a community share. These elements interact to give shape and definition to the conduct of inquiry, and provide a framework of how individuals in the community see, feel, think, and talk about events (Kuhn, 1970). In the context of this study, a paradigm in teacher education is conceived as a matrix of beliefs and assumptions about the nature and purpose of schooling, teaching, teachers and their education that gives shape to specific forms of practice in teacher education.

It can be argued that there was no single dominant position which conceptualized the meaning of teacher competence. There was a possibility to think about teacher education from a variety of viewpoints, each focusing on different aspects of teacher competence. However, there has emerged a dominant stance as a paradigm which prevents the members of the corresponding community to think about possibilities that do not lie within the framework of the particular orientation, and, as a consequence, limits chances for various inquiries into the meaning of teacher competence and open debates over the goals and purposes of

teacher education.

In recognition of the need to place current thinking about teacher competence in a historical perspective, the chapter begins with a discussion of how the scientific-technological understanding has emerged as the dominant paradigm in contemporary teacher education. The second part then pursues a critical understanding of the dominant paradigm in the fields of curriculum and teacher education. By taking "competency-based teacher education" movement as an example of technological understanding, the part tries to reveal what beliefs and assumptions the paradigm has in understanding teacher competence. A reflection on the scientific-technological understanding will follow in the last part of the chapter as a way of problematizing the dominant paradigm.

B. Historical Perspectives

Traditional Heritages

An image of the competent teacher has always existed because we want it to exist. Many of the current expectations of teacher competence are vestiges of our historical images, positive or negative, factual as well as fanciful.

Throughout European history, teachers were primarily religious disciplinarians (Castle, 1970). Education was aimed at protecting children from the errors of false belief

or from temptations of the world. This theme was well manifested in Plato's guarded education, in the efforts of the Christian Fathers to preserve children from the pagan way of life, and in the Calvinist and Jesuit schools. For this purpose there have always been teachers whose role was that of custodian of a particular way of life, of a morality that the schools existed to preserve. Teachers have been expected to be moral exemplars as well as to have knowledge and abilities which are pertinent to teaching some basics and classics.

Even in the relatively new tradition of America, this image of teacher has been retained except the fact that the teacher occupied a rather lowly position than in other societies. In a historical survey of teaching in America, Wynn (1960) recollects the teacher of the past:

> He [the teacher] was expected to be devoutly religious and of high moral character. This was the beginning of the tradition that still exists -that teachers, or "schoolmasters" as they were called then, should maintain a standard of conduct above that expected of most people. (p.89)

This is not much different from the Oriental tradition in which teachers have stood as a symbol of wisdom and adult rules. Confucianism, a deeply rooted philosophy in the everyday lives of the Korean people, has taught that teachers should be respected at the same level as one's parents and lord. In this tradition, Koreans have used the word " 스승 (su-sung)" to refer to a good teacher, which is somewhat distinguished from what the word "teacher" generally implies. Although translation into English cannot

do justice to its specific definition, there are several dimensions to be considered in defining it. The word "su-sung" means a possession of a wide base of knowledge, intellectual abilities or wisdom which excels those of others, and moral integrity. In particular, it connotes a teacher as a model of behavior for learners to pattern themselves after, with a sense of commitment to the calling they are destined to serve. It rejects strongly the notion that teaching is technical work.

Although many people today refute that teachers of the past were held in unconditional reverence with absolute authority, and that their abilities of classroom control were regarded as competence in teaching, it has long been emphasized in our heritage that teachers require good moral character and intellectual wisdom.

Liberal and Technical: The Age-Old Controversy

It is not until the nineteenth century that some technical skills in the method of teaching have been considered as a qualification of a teacher. Johann Herbart (1776-1841), in his analysis of teaching, recognized the need for teachers to have their own concepts of education and some techniques of working with children.

When the first formal institution for the preparation of teachers in America, the normal school, was founded in the middle of the nineteenth century, Horace Mann, who was one of the responsible founders, emphasized that some

teaching skills, as well as subject knowledge and moral character, are a part of essential qualifications of those who undertake the momentous task of teaching the children. Here is a part of the qualifications which he listed:

> 1st. One requisite is a knowledge of Common-school studies. Teachers should have a perfect knowledge of the rudimental branches which are required by law to be taught in our schools.
>
> 2nd. The next principal qualification in a teacher is the art of teaching.... The ability to acquire, and the ability to impart, are wholly different talents.
>
> 3rd. Experience has also proved that there is no necessary connection between literary competency, aptness to teach, and the power to manage and govern a school successfully. They are independent qualifications; yet a marked deficiency in any one of the three renders the others nearly valueless. (Horace Mann, "Report for 1840," cited in Saylor, 1976, p.22)

Mann's emphasis on the "art of teaching" seems not to restrict teaching into a matter of technical skill. Rather, he devoted much attention to the preparation of teachers who could carry out important tasks in building a democratic society by including good methods of teaching in the qualification of teachers. But, his emphasis on the method of teaching and the establishment of the normal school for the professional preparation of teachers seemed to be a cause for the age-old controversy between liberal and technical functions in teacher education.

Almost from the beginning of teacher education, as Merle Borrowman (1956) so well points out, the issue of liberal versus technical has become the most provocative controversy in teacher education. James Conant (1963, p.11)

also defines this quarrel "as a powerful struggle among professors, which has come to involve parents, alumni, legislators, and trustees." At the turn of this century this issue was defined largely in terms of the liberal arts college versus the teachers college. But this distinction has not been linear. There have also been efforts in the search for balance between the objectives that are traditionally emphasized by both the liberal arts college and the teachers college.

Borrowman (1956, pp.68-9) groups the early diverse thinkers on teacher education into four positions: the "academic purists," the "professional purists," the "harmonizers," and the "integrators." Each group had a different view in terms of the purpose for which educative action is taken or for which an educational structure is designed. Each position designates in general a curriculum organization, a way of teaching, and especially a definition of professional competence for teachers.

The purist position, which had emerged in both the academic and the professional, is characterized as singleness of purpose within a teacher education institution. On the academic purist side, this meant that no specialized professional concerns should be allowed to distort the balance of liberal studies. In its view, one trained to think is simultaneously trained to teach. The liberal education is to make certain that the individual thinks every problem of living, including the professional

ones, in the broadest scope possible. Teacher education is as much a liberal study as are the other new social sciences.

On the professional purist side, it meant that all instruction should be rigorously tested for its contribution to competence in classroom teaching. While the professional purist hoped for the day when prospective teachers would come to him or her already liberally educated, s/he insisted that the professional school should not dilute its efforts by trying to provide both liberal culture and professional training. Advocates of this position campaigned for a "strictly professional" teacher education with the open acceptance of utilitarian values in which immediate practical results provide the highest justification (Borrowman, 1965, p.15).

An increasing number of teacher educators, however, have realized that both liberal and professional education must be compromised rather than sharply separated from each other. Almost all educators today agree that the preparation of good teachers rests upon the harmonious integration of those two components. The relative emphasis that each area should receive, however, still provokes strong arguments among teacher educators.

So far as the "harmonizers" are concerned, for instance, a teacher education program tends to be thought of as still "liberal," although they do not conceive the distinction between general and professional education as

one of liberality or lack of it. On the other hand, for the "integrators," while they may cultivate some liberal functions, all segments of teacher education should be intermingled and organized from the professional point of view. Teacher education program is identified for them with the "technical." Borrowman (1956) defines the technical function of education as follows:

> Education functions technically when its purpose is the cultivation of skill in the actual performance of a previously determined task. It is less concerned with the determination of purpose and policy and more concerned with their implementation. Education which aims at technical proficiency generally places a premium on the reduction of specific tasks to effective routine. (pp.4-5)

Today's "harmonizers" set out to study the theoretical considerations of both the disciplines and the study of education in relation to each other. Some organize curricular concerns with a view toward understanding education as a discipline. But, they are in the minority today because of the diffusion of the "integrators" tradition as the dominant paradigm along with the dominance of scientific and technological conceptions of teacher education.

The Rise of Scientific Teacher Education

During the first half of this century, great changes were made in the entire system of education. The new social order evoked by the dramatic expansion of school systems, industrialization, urbanization, bureaucratized administration, and rapidly increased population, raised new

demands that required accommodation in prevailing programs of schooling and teaching.

Educational scholars of all kinds took part in the enterprise of transforming the schools in their theory and practice. A strong reaction against traditional pedagogy came from at least two different directions. On the one hand were progressive educators who saw the need for school activities and subjects designed to meet the everyday-life needs of all children. On the other were the subscribers of the so-called "scientific movement" in education (Lucas, 1984, p.7). Along with the development of a general social and behavioral science, scientific knowledge gradually appeared as that of highest worth, and the science of education was expected to spell out its implications for effective teaching and curriculum making.

A prominent figure who gave substance to the scientific movement in education in terms of curriculum planning and teacher education was Franklin Bobbitt. Introducing the method of "scientific management" developed within industrial management, he described the scientific construction of school curriculum in his widely quoted book, The Curriculum (1918). He theorized curriculum as a series of variables made up of ends and means, suggesting that an analogy for the process would be in the Latin root of the term curriculum, *currere*, meaning a racecourse whose starting and finishing points are unequivocably delineated.

Bobbitt's view on teacher education was elaborated in another work, How to Make a Curriculum (1924). For him teacher education was seen as vocational training, and the proper method of scientific inquiry was that of "job analysis." The analysis would consist in the study of the tasks a competent teacher carries out in his or her work, and the abilities to perform these tasks would constitute the objectives of teacher education. Bobbitt (1924) wrote about the methodology:

> The plan to be employed is activity-analysis. The first step is to analyze the broad range of human experience into major fields.... the second step is to take them, one after the other, and analyze them into their more specific activities.... At all stages of the analysis, attention should be fixed upon the actual activities of mankind. (pp.8-9)

Adopting the method of job-analysis, Charters and Waples (1929) actually carried out a study, The Commonwealth Teacher Training Study, to investigate "scientifically" the traits and activities that define good teaching. As a result, 83 traits of excellent teachers were listed and defined, and then telescoped into 25 broader categories. The list of teachers' activities numbered 1,001 items, and with their definitions covered 168 pages (cited in Kliebard, 1975c, p.35).

Psychologists provided much of the impetus for the rapid development of the "scientific movement" in education. In particular, the works of E.L. Thorndike, often referred to as the "test and measurement movement," was decisive. Not only could "scientific movement" in education benefit

directly from the statistical methods of Thorndike, but also his contribution to the psychology of learning and individual differences could serve as crucial complements to the research on curriculum and teaching.

A.S. Barr should also be mentioned as an influential figure in the stream of making scientific teacher education. Using the statistical methodology of Thorndike to solve the problem of measuring teacher competence, Barr, in his early research (1931), gathered the data from classroom observation, and analyzed them for evidence on the nature and role of specific teaching techniques and teacher behavior patterns. His research culminated in 209 available scales with 6,939 separate items (cited in Johnson, H., 1984, p.52).

In the search for a "scientific method" to define teacher competence, it was inevitable to adopt "an industrial model of efficient production" (Smith, 1975, p.7). Suddenly, some words borrowed from economics such as "effectiveness," "efficiency," "input and output," became the topic in the research field on teaching and teacher education during the 1960s. The logic of "systems analysis" and "management by objectives" were introduced to education. In this logic, the "good" in the search for good teaching simply meant "economical" more than anything else.

Out of the work and thought of Bobbitt and Charters as well as the ideas of behavioral psychology, their like-minded contemporaries have been eager to find the

elements which constitute the traits of the good teacher. As a result, there exists an extensive body of studies on the analysis of teacher behavior in the classroom, on the analysis of classroom communication, and on the factors conducive to teacher effectiveness. The behavioral and analytic approach to research on teaching and teacher effectiveness expanded by leaps and bound, and the results are summarized well in several editions.[2]

C. The Dominant Paradigm in Understanding Teacher Competence

The Field of Curriculum

Teacher education cannot be considered independently from curricular thought. Since our purpose in teacher education is the preparation of individuals to deal with matters of school curriculum, it is argued that what we do in teacher education is a manifestation of a particular perspective we have of curricular activities. In attempting to examine the field of teacher education, therefore, a brief review on the field of curriculum may be necessary.

---

[2] Gage, N.L. eds. Handbook of Research on Teaching (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1963); Biddle, B.L. and Ellena, W.J. eds. Contemporary Research on Teacher Effectiveness (New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1964); Simon, A. and Boyer, E.G. Mirrors for Behavior: An Anthology of Classroom Observation Instruments (Philadelphia: Research for Better School, 1967, 1970); Travers, R.M.W. eds. Second Handbook of Research on Teaching (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1973); Medley, D.M. Teacher Competence and Teacher Effectiveness: A Review of Process-Product Research (Washington,D.C.: AACTE, 1977); Powell, M. and Beard, J.W. Teacher Effectiveness: An Annotated Bibliography and Guide to Research (New York: Garland, 1984)

In the curriculum field, William Pinar (1975a, pp.ix-xii) contends that contemporary curricular thought is characterized by a tripartite division consisting of traditionalists, conceptual-empiricists and reconceptualists. James Macdonald (1975a, p.6) also delineates three recognizable groups among "theorizers" about the purpose of curriculum theorizing: (1) those who see theory as a guiding framework for applied curriculum development and research; (2) those who attempt to identify and describe the empirical validation of curriculum variables and their relationships; and (3) those who look upon the task of theorizing as a creative intellectual task for criticism.

From the point of this study, however, the distinction between traditionalists and conceptual-empiricists is not necessary. Both have functioned in a similar role in fostering the dominant way of understanding teacher competence, i.e., the scientific-technological understanding. Hence, I will discuss some of the figures who have led the field into the scientific and technological domain without making a distinction between them.

Pinar (1975a) cites several examples of classical texts in the field of curriculum. Among them, Ralph Tyler's Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction (1949) appears to be the most influential work. In this book, Tyler clarified and amplified the traditional view of curriculum making by identifying four fundamental questions concerning curriculum

and instruction, otherwise known as the "Tyler Rationale" (Kliebard, 1975a). Tyler's four basic questions are:

(1) What educational purposes should the school seek to attain?

(2) What educational experiences can be provided that are likely to attain these purposes?

(3) How can these educational experiences be effectively organized?

(4) How can we determine whether these purposes are being attained?

These four questions exhibit well the traditional way of curriculum making emphasizing the problem-solving nature of the curriculum venture. The Tyler rationale is a conceptualization of the common sense of people in which ends are separate from means. Decisions about objectives or ends, according to Tyler, are separate from and made prior to decisions about activities or means because "all aspects of the educational program are really means to accomplish basic educational purposes" (Tyler, 1949, p.3).

Answering the first question is thus most important. Tyler proposes a two-step framework for answering the first question. The first step is to consult three sources for objectives: studies of learners, studies of contemporary life, and suggestions from subject specialists. The second step is to filter the data derived from the three sources through psychological and philosophical screens. Those propositions which survive the screens are to serve as the

educational objectives toward which and out of which specific curricula, instructional practices, and evaluation procedures are to be developed.

Numerous curriculum theorists have attempted to extend and improve the Tyler model. Certainly, Hilda Taba (1962) is one of the closest followers of Tyler. She suggests the seven steps of curriculum planning expanding Tyler's four questions. Those steps are: (1) Diagnosis of needs; (2) Formation of objectives; (3) Selection of content; (4) Organization of content; (5) Selection of learning experiences; (6) Organization of learning experiences; and (7) Determination of what to evaluate and of the ways and means of doing it (p.12).

It is interesting to note that Taba credits Tyler with having developed "scientific curriculum development," which, she claims, "needs to draw upon analysis of society and culture, study of the learner and the learning process, and analysis of the nature of knowledge in order to determine the purpose of the school and the nature of its curriculum" (p.10). But, her modification of the Tyler model has not appreciably altered its substance; rather, it served to reaffirm its basic assumptions.

Tyler's and his followers' idea has really not been theoretical in the technical sense of the word. Their major task was providing a framework which helps to manage curriculum that the practitioners could then try to organize. Their idea was basically practical and pragmatic

because they saw "theory as a guiding framework for applied curriculum development and research and as a tool for evaluation of curriculum development" (Macdonald, 1975a, p.5). Pinar and Grumet (1981) also comment:

> These questions [Tyler's] are not designed to generate theories of the curriculum, to collect data concerning its complex presence in schools nor to contribute to a discipline increasingly conscious of its problems and assumptions. The major texts which followed Tyler's all accepted this administrative or managerial function of the curriculum field. (p.22)

The structure of the disciplines movement is another example of this modification. In the 1960's, a group of curriculum theorists were interested in reorganizing the subject matter of the schools around structural generalizations and inquiry methods of the disciplines.

The most influential work in this movement is Jerome Bruner's The Process of Education (1960)[3] which can be understood as a modification of the Tyler framework, but still within the genre of the Tyler rationale. Bruner's statement "one must take into account the issues of predisposition, structure, sequence, and reinforcement in preparing curricular materials" (p.70), and his insistence that curriculum should be prepared jointly by the subject matter expert, the psychologist, and the teacher, with due regard for the inherent structure of the material, and the

---

[3] Bruner has revisited his work in 1971. He retrospects that in his earlier emphasis upon the structure of the discipline, he had overestimated the inherent interest of learners, and could not give enough considerations to the social and political factors in curriculum issues. See Jerome S. Bruner, "The Process of Education Revisited," Phi Delta Kappan (September, 1971).

building and maintaining of predispositions to problem solving both echo the Tyler rationale.

What sets this movement somewhat apart from the traditional model are its perceptions regarding the source of curricular content. The proponents of this movement give a great deal of attention to the significance of "the structure of a discipline," in contradistinction to traditional curricular "content," generally defined as information to be transferred to students by rote or verbal learning. According to Bruner (1960), "the curriculum of a subject should be determined by the most fundamental understanding that can be achieved of the underlying principles that give structure to that subject" (p.31). Considering the young learner as a miniature scholar-specialist, the generalizations and methods of the "structure of a discipline" doctrine are invariably cast into a Tylerian model (Molnar & Zahorik, 1977, p.4).

The Tyler model and the technological line of curriculum thinking have also been extended by curriculum engineers and instructional technologists. Prominent among these individuals is George Beauchamp (1968), who may be identified as a conceptual-empiricist. The curriculum field, as far as he is concerned, is based on social science and technological applications of empirical research. While he argues for a more clearly defined notion of who plans and develops curriculum, his bias is certainly with trained social scientists for efficient "curriculum system

engineering."

Beauchamp (1968, pp.116-139) identifies five decision-making areas that in effect constitute a model of "curriculum engineering." They are: (1) the arena for curriculum engineering, (2) selection and involvement of people, (3) organization and procedures for curriculum planning, (4) curriculum implementation, and (5) curriculum evaluation. Comprehensive as it is, his systems approach leaves unanswered many questions concerning curriculum theorizing. Furthermore, the "top-down" organizational orientation of the model leads us to conclude that in many respects it closely resembles the administrative or managerial model described by Tyler.

The technological conception of curriculum is further extended by Mauritz Johnson. Johnson (1981, p.73) argues that the generally accepted definition of curriculum as "planned learning experiences" is unsatisfactory because it fails to distinguish curriculum from instruction, and proceeds to define curriculum as "a structured series of intended learning outcomes." In such a definition, the distinction between ends and means is not difficult to make. This is highly mechanistic, for the focal point is ends and the assessment of end products; only those end products that can be measured quantitatively as behavioral objectives are considered legitimate. Teaching is then conceived as a systematic technology in the production process that leads to measurable outcomes called "terminal behavior."

The technological orientation provides more than simply systematic management of curriculum; it facilitates the technological enterprise in all aspects of education. Underlying this administrative and technological mode of curiculum thought, one can easily find a solid basis of educational assumptions. The dominant theme throughout has been the importance of the school's conserving role in society. Schools are regarded as social institutions to teach basic knowledge and skills essential to leading a useful and productive life, and to keep the existing society functioning. School curriculum is reflected in this practical concern of the society. This concern then raises questions only about the best or most efficient way to transmit a specific kind of knowledge.

We recall an inquiry by Kliebard (1975b, pp.40-42) that reveals "a drive toward a supremely functional curriculum largely oriented toward socially useful knowledge and skills," and basically this has been the "atheoretical and ameliorative orientation" in the curriculum field. The scientific-technological perspective on curriculum is primarily practical and non-reflective. Little more can be said of extensive philosophical speculation. The style of teaching and learning, the practice of teacher education and its understanding of teacher competence can easily be imagined from this curricular perspective.

CBTE: An Example of Technological Teacher Education

A brief examination of the recent literature concerning teacher education reveals that the scientific or technological orientation is the first and probably the most dominant trend in current research and practice of teacher education. The emergence of Performance or Competency Based Teacher Education (P/CBTE)[4] at the latter part of the 1960's and its propagation during the 1970's are the influential manifestations of this orientation. Therefore, it is conceived that taking CBTE movement as an example is enough to show how the meaning of teacher competence is interpreted in scientific-technological teacher education.

CBTE is a systems approach to teacher education developed as a model of competency-based instruction for pre-service and in-service teacher education. Although CBTE involves many different variations, common to all is a technological framework for pedagogy which consists of objectives, activities, outcomes, and evaluation with a systems approach to the educative process.

No two people seem to define CBTE in exactly the same way. But the most widely quoted definition of CBTE is by Stanley Elam (1971). According to him, the essential characteristics of CBTE are as follows:

(1) Competencies (knowledge, skills, behaviors) to be demonstrated by the student are
    * Derived from explicit conceptions of teacher roles;

---

[4] PBTE and CBTE are used interchangeablely. CBTE will be used in this writing except in direct quotations.

* Stated so as to make possible assessment of a student's behavior in relation to specific competencies; and
* Made public in advance.

(2) Criteria to be employed in assessing competencies are
* Based upon, and in harmony with, specified competencies;
* Explicit in stating expected levels of mastery under specified conditions; and
* Made public in advance.

(3) Assessment of the student's competency
* Uses his performance as the primary source of evidence;
* Takes into account evidence of the student's knowledge relevant to planning for, analyzing, interpreting, or evaluating situation or behavior; and
* Strives for objectivity.

(4) The student's rate of progress through the program is determined by demonstrated competency rather than by time of course completion.

(5) The instructional program is intended to facilitate the development and evaluation of the student's achievement of competencies specified. (cited in Houston, 1974, p.9)

If the term "competence" is defined in an ordinary way as "adequacy for a task" or as "possession of required knowledge, skills, and abilities," it is clear that any mode of education aims for competence ,for the development of well-qualified individuals who possess the required knowledge and skills. "Standard dictionaries provide no definition for competency-based." As Houston and Howsam (1972, p.3) write, "this is a coined word of recent origin." The term "competency-based" has, thus, become a special designation for a special movement in education.

Boosted in earlier "integrators" tradition Borrowman (1956) identified, CBTE has evolved the basic principles enunciated by Bobbitt and Charters. Some of the factors contributing to the CBTE movement have been strategic

support of government funding for priority programs, industry's intervention in the production of educational packages and standardized tests, the struggle to define the status of teaching as a profession, and the demand of accountability in all sectors of public life.

Henry Johnson (1975) identifies the origin of CBTE as essentially social and political rather than theoretical:

> They [CBTE movements] have largely arisen from the joint efforts of state educational officials and administrator-oriented professional bodies -for example the AACTE[5] and various state educational agencies. The movement is thus not only broadly social but closely linked to political development. (p.156)

In fact, CBTE has been the core of the debate on teacher education over the last two decades. The proponents have believed that CBTE is a "promise of renovating and regenerating teacher education" (Houston & Howsam, 1972, p.viii), while the critics have argued that CBTE deals only with low-level cognitive learnings and meaningless skills (Broudy, 1972,1984; Smith, 1975; Tom,1977). In America today, however, CBTE is widely accepted in the research and practice of teacher education, and is touted as an "ultimate aspirin for educational headaches" (Piper & Houston, 1980, p.37).

Technological Framework for Teacher Competence

In order to capture more clearly what CBTE is, and how teacher competence is understood in scientific-technological

---

[5] American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education

understanding, one has to examine the basic components of CBTE which comprise a framework of technological pedagogy. They are: (1) performance objectives; (2) systems approach; and (3)the accountability movement in education.

Performance Objectives

The starting point of any CBTE program is an explicit specification of those knowledge, skills and behaviors whose attainment is believed to indicate the competent teacher. The specification of competence must be stated in terms of observable behaviors of students. Richard Burns (1972) argues:

> The only evidence available to show that an individual has learned something is his ability to perform or do something that overtly demonstrates the learning.... Therefore, we conclude that a teacher education program should be based on objectives -statements of specific, learnable behavior, including standards of performance. (p.19)

Historically, Ralph Tyler (1949) is generally given credit for the current emphasis on the ideas of writing behavioral objectives by asserting that the formation of objectives is the necessary first step in developing a curriculum. He was evidently concerned with the assessment techniques that can be utilized to evaluate whether or not the student has achieved the prescribed learning objectives. Later, the behavioral objectives movement began to take hold with the assistances of Bloom (1956), Mager (1962) and Gronlund (1974).

Especially Mager's work (1962) has served as a catalytic agent in the promotion and conceptualization of the behavioral objectives movement. Under Mager's approach, a behavioral objective is defined as performance or "terminal behavior" expected from a student after the learning process, serving as a "criterion" by which the performance can be judged to be successful, and specified "conditions" that are necessary for the performance to occur satisfactorily. We can find all of these elements of behavioral objectives in the definition of CBTE.

At first, the behavioral objectives movement appeared to offer a simple solution to the concerns of Tyler regarding assessment techniques. However, problems have arisen in the tendency for the whole process of education to be understood in terms of behavioral objectives. This trend is common to all CBTE programs.

In the discussions of behavioral objectives, four synonyms are often treated to have different meanings. They are: teacher competency, teacher competence, teacher performance, and teacher effectiveness. Medley (1984) distinguishes the four terms as follows:

> Teacher Competency will be defined here as any single knowledge, skill, or professional value which (1) a teacher may be said to possess, and (2) the possession of which is believed to be relevant to the successful practice of teaching.
>
> Teacher Competence is defined in terms of repertoire; how competent a teacher is depends on the repertoire of competencies he or she possesses.
>
> Teacher Performance refers to what the teacher does on the job (that is, how competent he or she is); it

is, therefore, specific to the job situation.

Teacher Effectiveness refers to the effect that the teacher's performance has on pupils. (pp.53-55)

CBTE followers prefer to use the terms "competency" or "performance" rather than "competence" to denote behavioral objectives in CBTE. Thus, the term "Competency-Based Teacher Education refers to teacher education organized in terms of specified competencies" (Medley, 1984, p.53).

Performance objectives in CBTE, therefore, specify teacher competence into discrete competencies. This means that the main force of CBTE lies in analyzing teacher competence into segments of overt behaviors to be stated and tested. It contrasts overt performances with covert competence, and argues that practicing the performance directly is more efficient than achieving competence indirectly.

The performance objectives may serve well as overt means measuring the amount of learning that has occurred. In fact, they are perhaps the only method for obtaining visible evidence. But the problem with this limited approach is the fact that it would prohibit student teachers from being educated for the competence that cannot be expressed into overtly observable behaviors. Limiting teacher competence to those behaviors which are observable essentially eliminates the broad, complex, and cumulative competence -the truly important teacher competence. As Waks (1975) says, the notion of performance objectives reflects strongly "the doctrine of technological planning and evaluation" (p.87),

and makes educators "solitary and naked individuals in meaningless words" (p.100).

Systems Approach

CBTE formulates the basic pedagogical assumptions underpinning systems theory. Anthony Oettinger offers a view of systems theory:

> There is today a widely held point of view which most anything and education in particular, can be described as a collection or system of interdependent parts belonging to a hierarchy in which a system may have subsystems of its own while acting as a mere part of a suprasystem. The process of analyzing such systems, called "systems analysis" for short, is touted as one of the shiniest of new technologies. (cited in Tanner & Tanner, 1980, p.28)

The systems approach is a kind of management method originally developed in the areas of industry for efficient production and effective control. A common theme in this approach is to develop more cost-effective strategies for administrative management by clarifying the goals of a system, designing plans for achieving those goals, measuring results, diagnosing difficulties, and modifying plans accordingly. It was soon extended to the area of public administration, and to win a reputation for its efficiency in matters of decision-making and executive management in the public sector.

Predictably, many school people saw in this business-like management procedure a hope for more effective educational planning and control for more efficient educational production as well. The idea of the systems

approach, therefore, has rapidly spread to educators who have searched for efficiency in education. With the support of the government and introducing technology into education, they have produced "new" methods in teaching such as Individually Prescribed Instruction (IPI) or Computer Managed Instruction (CMI). Teacher education? Why not? Richard Burns (1972) has argued:

> Education can be viewed as a system whose parts can be defined, classified, measured, improved -in other words, can be managed systematically to improve the efficiency of all process, parts, and procedures. The production of competent teachers can be approached as a management problem, using many of the techniques developed for industrial management. (p.19, emphasis mine)

Since the effectiveness of a system, it is argued, depends on how well the subsystems are integrated for the final products, teacher competence is geared to measurable outcomes in students. For the maximum efficiency all subsystems should be controlled and managed by objectives. The proponents of systems theory think that teacher competence is valuable in so far as it contributes to the systems objectives. It is here that we can find a technological rationale so deeply embedded in CBTE. When one thinks of the complex enterprise of education, the difference between a mechanical act and an authentically human one must be considered.

Accountability in Education

Since the government has begun taking a more active part in educational systems, the politicians are publicly

accountable for the decisions they make, and are in turn asking that educators become responsible for their educational act. One common feature of arguments for accountability in education today might go something like this: Despite worrisome and rising educational expenditures, too many schools are failing to educate too many of our youth. School personnel must be held accountable for the fulfillment of educational tasks.

Inasmuch as nobody can deny that every person has responsibility for his or her work, CBTE is right when it considers that teacher education is responsible for educating competent teachers. How can teacher education then be accountable? That teacher education must, like business and industry, produce visible products in terms of student learning outcomes is a widely shared belief among CBTE proponents. Frederick McDonald (1974) notes:

> A program of teacher training is effective if it produces teachers with certain desired characteristics, the most important being that teachers are able to influence the learning of their students in significant ways. The ultimate justification of any program is the evidence that its teachers can and do help children learn. (p.18)

CBTE proponents believe that teacher competence must be selected and defined with reference to their effects on student achievement, and should be a demonstrated competence to enable children to learn. No doubt the CBTE proponents are enthusiastic about linking teacher competence to student learning because such a connection would provide a solid empirical foundation for the criterion for judging teacher

competence.

Demonstrated teacher competence becomes now teacher effectiveness. A large part of the research on teaching today is characterized as a search for teacher effectiveness. The main issue here is to find relationships between specific teacher behaviors -teacher characteristics or teaching techniques- and student learning outcomes. Clusters of studies conducted under the name of "process-product research" (Medley, 1977) show numerous relationships, and the results, it is believed by proponents, can give the "scientific basis of the art of teaching" as Gage (1978) states:

> We do have some relationships between teacher behavior and pupil achievement and attitudes on which a scientific basis for the art of teaching may be erected. (p.35)

These studies constitute a complex maze of different techniques and conceptual approaches, but yet they seem to have a common denominator in the search for strong theories, which may explain and predict teaching effects and thus contribute to the "efficiency of teaching."

CBTE manages a shift away from the philosophical and psychological properties of teacher competence to only behavioral performances. The shift is an affirmation that CBTE views the competent teacher as the efficient producer of results, and this tells again that CBTE is a technological framework for teacher education.

D. Making the Dominant Understanding Problematic

As was reviewed above, the contemporary trend of research and practices in the fields of curriculum and teacher education strongly reflect the scientific-technological orientation to the framework for pedagogy. Technological pedagogy, in turn, forces us to understand the meaning of teacher competence according to its logic in terms of specific behavioral performances and empirical links between teacher behavior and student learning outcomes.

In this technological logic, unobservable and unmeasurable traits of teachers cannot be considered. It is conceived that, as B.F. Skinner (1971, pp.191-3) argues, "talking about something like autonomous man is time consuming and an expression of our ignorance. Man is a machine in the sense that he is a complex system behaving in lawful ways." That there are certain teacher behaviors which consistently produce results such as student achievement, and that these behaviors can be integrated into coherent theoretical systems, are unquestioned assumptions held by CBTE advocates. Pedagogy, the relationship among teacher, students and text, is regarded as a "rigorous science" that is concerned with the question of how vast amounts of information can be transmitted effectively.

The notion of "scientific management" adapted to teacher education urges it to deal only with external skills and techniques that yield 100 per cent efficiency while it

sees a competent teacher as a productive technician. Doyle Watts (1978), an educational psychologist, likens teacher education to training surgeons, airline pilots, and engineers, and expresses the technological mind more clearly:

> In summary, I submit that teacher education is a process of developing highly trained and skilled professionals; that the procedures should be well planned and designed, with specific outcomes produced. (p.90)

A competent teacher is seen in this technological understanding as only a skilled technician or an intermediary who is putting into practice effectively those ideas or programs that have been developed elsewhere by educational experts. S/he is a professional "behavior engineer" who knows how to control student behaviors. S/he is expected to be a teaching machine of high performance.

In terms of effective production which can be observable and measurable, technological machines including computers can go far beyond the limits of the capacity of the human teacher. Should human teachers compete with technological machines in terms of efficient production? B.F.Skinner would probably answer "yes". He (1968) expresses:

> The simple fact is that, as a mere reinforcing mechanism, the teacher is out of date. This would be true even if a single teacher devoted all her time to a single child, but her inadequacy is multiplied many fold when she must serve as a reinforcing device to many children at once. (p.22)

While taking the methods of laboratory scientists as a model of authoritative research procedure and valuing

experimental design, predictability, reproducibility, and the control of behavior, the technological understanding delimits teacher competence to only the quantifiable and the measurable. It promises a science of educational understanding which, it is claimed, can provide an objective, neutral and authoritative guide for prospective teachers about pedagogical situations.

A preference for technical aspects above everything else reflects a "vocational and utilitarian mode of professionalism" (Finkelstein, 1982, p.26). Another way of saying this would be that the predominant orientation in teacher education is concerned with a theoretical effort to establish an operative technology of teaching. While the advocates of CBTE argue that their approach is an important departure from conventional teacher education, they significantly reduce our understanding of teacher competence into behavioral terminology. "The current state," as Bowers (1982, p.540) says, "makes it increasingly difficult to attempt to understand education in terms of more humane considerations than cost-effective management of human resources."

Nevertheless, the technological ideals seem to persist as the predominant interest in contemporary inquiries into the meaning of teacher competence. It should be noted, however, that teacher competence can be supported on quite different assumptions and philosophies. "As we attempt to observe and understand teaching," as Kliebard (1973, p.23)

sees, "we may discover that teaching, after all, does not involve the exercise of a technical skill."

At this point, my best hope is to step back and re-think the questions we are seeking to answer. When an answer such as scientific or technological understanding is given to us as to what teacher competence means, we need to ask a question about the questions it has sought to answer. Susanne Langer (1954) points out the nature of a question:

> A question is really an ambiguous proposition; the answer is its determination. There can be only a certain number of alternatives that will complete its sense. (pp.1-2)

We need a more fundamental question; what questions should be asked in order to understand the meaning of teacher competence more authentically? Making authentic questions is in a sense more important than answering the questions, and it inevitably requires our deeper understanding of teacher competence which is believed to be possible through a thoughtful examination on our everyday commitments in educating teachers.

Chapter III

SEARCHING FOR A WAY OF DEEPER UNDERSTANDING

A. Introduction

In the previous chapter, the dominant stance toward teacher education was uncovered through an examination of literature in the field of curriculum and teacher education. The examination shows that the scientific-technological paradigm understands teacher competence from a view that is narrowly technical, adopting a technological framework for pedagogy which consists of the rationales of performance objectives, systems approach and the accountability movement in education.

The examination suggests that there is a need for a study that inquires into a concrete teacher education program in order to understand how the dominant mode of research acts in a practical situation. Such an inquiry would direct attention to revealing how the term "teacher competence" is understood in a particular teacher education program, and to coming to a deeper understanding as to how the term might appropriately be understood.

An attempt to understand the meaning of a term may be difficult to be achieved by the problem-solving stance typically used in educational research; rather, it seems to require a form of inquiry in which human understanding itself must be considered a problem. The root of the problem as to what the term "teacher competence" really means seems

to lie in the problem of human understanding.

In this sense, it is hoped that hermeneutics as a way of understanding will be an appropriate approach for this study in the form of a concrete study both for making available an interpretation of a teacher education curriculum and a deeper understanding of the meaning of teacher competence. I will thus outline and discuss in this chapter some aspects of hermeneutics, although the discussion will be within the limits of my interest in interpreting the curriculum texts selected for the study

Moderr hermeneutics has been developed based on the contributions of a number of prominent philosophers and social thinkers. While recognizing differences in some points of detail and approaches among contemporary hermeneutic theorists (see Bleicher, 1980; Thompson, 1981; Howard, 1982), my discussion will be based mainly on Hans-Georg Gadamer's notion of philosophical hermeneutics. This does not mean that the others are ineligible for the study or disregarded in the discussion; rather, I will refer to them complementarily from the point of my concern.

This chapter is divided into three parts. It begins with a brief review of the hermeneutical tradition by sketching some central figures[4] in its development. In the second part, I will explore the notion of Gadamer's philosophical hermeneutics by concentrating upon his main

---

[4] For the identification of the central figures in the hermeneutical tradition, I am indebted to Richard Palmer (1969).

work, Truth and Method (1975a)[7] with reference to some of his other essays including Philosophical Hermeneutics (1976). These two parts will then serve as a background for the consideration of the research approach of this study which will be dealt with in the last part of this chapter.

B. The Tradition of Hermeneutics

The Origin of Hermeneutics

Hermeneutics is concerned with the interpretation of meaning. The word itself has its origin in the Greek verb *hermeneuein*, generally translated "to interpret," and the noun *hermeneia*, "interpretation" (Palmer, 1969, p.12). The basic meaning is "to bring to understanding" or "to mediate understanding" with respect to the various forms in which understanding may be problematic.

The term hermeneutics has been in disfavor in some quarters, partly perhaps on the understanding that it is no more than theological jargon for the work of biblical exegesis. Traditionally, hermeneutics entailed the formulation of rules for the interpretation of The Christian Testament, especially in linguistic and historical terms without any special reference to the situation of the reader or interpreter. The interpreter was urged to begin with the language of the text, including its grammar, vocabulary and style, and then to examine its linguistic, literary, and

---

[7] Hereafter cited as TM in this chapter.

historical context. In other words, traditional hermeneutics was concerned with the observance of interpretive rules within the scheme of the Holy Scripture (Thiselton, 1980, p.11).

With the rise of historical science at the beginning of the nineteenth century, however, the hermeneutical problem took a new turn. It had become secularized and had grown into a branch of philosophy concerned with methodological questions about how to acquire correct understanding in an interpretation of texts. In this century, hermeneutics has become a broader philosophy of human sciences whose cognition ultimately involves the process of interpretation rather than the deductive-nomological way of explanation.

When we trace the development of the hermeneutical tradition, we can see that it was almost always defined as an affirmative reaction against dominant theological, epistemological and metaphysical presuppositions deemed to foreclose and limit the possibilities of human knowing. Hermeneutics has developed by uncovering the conditions of a particular way of viewing the world and of knowledge acquisition which insisted on the essential unity of science and a univocal conception of knowledge and explanation in all the sciences. It was a resistance to tendencies in social sciences toward objectivism, scientism, or positivism.

Consequently, the term "understanding" has come to be used to denote a type of inquiry germane to the

hermeneutical tradition in contradiction to the method of "explanation" indigenous to the natural sciences and positivistic tradition. Paul Ricoeur (1976) states:

> Understanding, which is more directed towards the intentional unity of discourse, and explanation, which is more directed towards the analytic structure of the texts, tend to become the distinct poles of a developed dichotomy. (p.74)

To explore how the hermeneutical tradition has formulated a critique of the positivistic explanation of human knowing, and how it has developed a unique philosophy of human understanding, it would be of benefit to examine some figures who have contributed significantly to the development of this tradition.

Schleiermacher's General Hermeneutics

Various interpretive techniques and some sophisticated hermeneutical traditions had already been developed by the beginning of the nineteenth century, but it had remained essentially a rule-governed discipline bound by an interest in the construction of universally valid interpretation. The essential unity and identity of the process of understanding and interpretation had not been brought properly into view.

It was Friedrich Schleiermacher (1768-1834), a distinguished philosopher and theologian of the romanticist period, who gave birth to a general science of hermeneutics by bringing together two major hermeneutical traditions -the philological and the theological- into a "general hermeneutics as the art of understanding" (Palmer, 1969,

p.84). Schleiermacher extended biblical hermeneutics into a general hermeneutics, universal in scope and valid for the wider problems of interpretation. The principles of hermeneutics were to be understood as basic to any kind of textual and historical understanding.

Schleiermacher's advance in hermeneutics was in large part due to his transcendental approach to the problem of interpretation. Going behind the particular rules of religious and literary exegesis to an analysis of interpretation in general, he addressed himself to the question: How can we derive the possibility of valid interpretation and critically define its limits in terms of objective criteria? For Schleiermacher, every expression must be referred to an active source in the human mind, not simply to a set of formal rules of composition. He believed that the objectifications of mind consist neither of automatic units nor of imitations of foreordained rules; they are the creative powers of human consciousness. This is why he is sometimes called the "Kant of hermeneutics" (Ermarth, 1978, p.244). Indeed, it can be said that Schleiermacher's hermeneutics reformulated a Kantian dialectic between determinant and reflective judgment into a schema which has an objective core.

Schleiermacher's original language-oriented conception of hermeneutics was replaced in his later reflection by a much greater emphasis on subjectivity and psychological factors in understanding. He distinguished between the

linguistic or grammatical aspect of hermeneutics and the psychological aspect of the subject. Grammatical hermeneutics requires the use of objective linguistic resources while psychological hermeneutics involves penetration into the inner connections of thought that characterizes an author's own consciousness. Just as an understanding of an individual word demands an understanding of the whole, each individual thought that lies behind single linguistic articulation must be understood in the whole context of the author's life. This hermeneutical circle is expanded to an understanding of human life and existence as a whole.

Although Schleiermacher's formulation of a general hermeneutics shares with romanticism the emphasis on feeling and subjective experience, his ideas of general hermeneutics and the concept of understanding as a relationship to life provided the methodological foundation for Dilthey's project on the human sciences.

Dilthey's Historical Hermeneutics

Wilhelm Dilthey (1833-1911) is best known for his controversial doctrine of human understanding. Dilthey defended the autonomy of human studies against natural sciences, and saw hermeneutics as the foundation for the new science that he came to call the *Geisteswissenschaften*[*]. It

---

[*] Although the German word *Geisteswissenschaften* has no satisfactory English equivalent, the widely accepted expression "human sciences" remains the best known translation.

was Dilthey's aim throughout his life to go beyond the narrow, natural scientific ideal of science and to show that a different kind of science on human studies is possible.

As the term *Geisteswissenschaften*, i.e., science of the mental or psychical sphere, shows, Dilthey saw a fundamental distinction between natural sciences and human sciences, and elaborated his own psychological and historical methodology for the human sciences. His main concern was to develop a method of gaining objectively valid interpretation of human experiences based on hermeneutics.

Dilthey maintained that the difference between the two types of sciences is rooted in a difference within the realm of human experience: inner lived experience and outer sensory experience. To understand means to know something from the perspective of one's inner experience. But, nature has no inside; those things which have no inside can only be explained. In his view, thus, human sciences are the sciences of understanding, whereas natural sciences are the sciences of explanation. Dilthey writes:

> Now the *Geisteswissenschaften* are distinguished from the natural sciences first of all by the fact that the latter have as their object facts that enter consciousness from without, as phenomena, and as given singly, whereas the facts of the former sciences enter consciousness in an original way from within, as a reality and as a living coherence. From this it follows that the coherence of nature presented by the natural sciences is achieved only through inferences that add to the given by way of a combination of hypothesis. For the *Geisteswissenschaften*, by contrast, it follows that the coherence of mental life, as something originally given, is everywhere their basis. We explain nature, but we understand mental life. (Dilthey, Ideas Concerning a Descriptive and

Analytic Psychology, cited in Plantinga, 1980, p.33).

In his continuing efforts to liberate the methodology of the human sciences from the explanative and constructionist ideals of the natural sciences, Dilthey insisted that the human sciences are preeminently hermeneutical in character; they understand objectified meanings within a coherence of contexts. Dilthey regarded the historical consciousness and transcendental consciousness as two complementary aspects of the same general intellectual transformation: one's understanding of him/herself and the appropriation of his or her own creative capacities. The idea of historical understanding served as a converging term for a whole range of Dilthey's hermeneutics.

From Dilthey's hermeneutical perspective, all understanding must rest upon the "lived experience" of human life by way of its process and objectification. For he considered that human sciences are "empirical" like the natural sciences, the valid understanding of the human world must have objectivity if the understanding is not to be an arbitrary or mystical communication with others. Dilthey sought the ground of the validity of understanding from the lived experience of life which is culturally and historically formulated. Because life objectifies itself in fixed expressions that are open to being understood, Dilthey believed, the historian is able to understand not only the private experience of the author but also the universal realm of objective spirit.

However, Dilthey's historical understanding was still in the shadow of nineteenth century rationalism. In developing his notion of understanding, Dilthey adopted Schleiermacher's psychological hermeneutics and Hegel's notion of "absolute spirit." In any case, it is obvious that Dilthey's metascience failed to escape from its Cartesian pre-suppositions and thereby remained unable to do justice to its interest in guiding hermeneutical cognition (Bleicher, 1980, p.24).

Heidegger's Ontological Hermeneutics

With the publication of Martin Heidegger's Being and Time in 1927 (English translation, 1962), a decisive new stage in hermeneutical tradition opened up. The question to which Heidegger devoted lifelong commitment is the question about the meaning of being. Hermeneutics enters his discussion because his exposition of the meaning of being demands an interpretation of Dasein as the place where being is manifest.

Fundamental ontology is to be pursued for existential analysis of Dasein because Dasein has a preontological understanding of what it means to be. In this analysis of Dasein, Heidegger adopted Dilthey's conception of "lived experience" and Husserl's phenomenology, but he was no longer dependent on the epistemological implications of Dilthey's return to life or Husserl's way of transcendental reduction. On the contrary, all this became the object of

Heidegger's critique. Hermeneutics, for Heidegger, meant that fundamental announcing function through which Dasein makes known to himself the nature of being. Heidegger writes in the introduction of his Being and Time (1962):

> Finally, to the extent that Dasein, as an entity with the possibility of existence, has ontological priority over every other entity, "hermeneutic", as an interpretation of Dasein's Being, has the third and specific sense of an analytic of the existentiality of existence; and this is the sense which is philosophically primary. Then so far as this hermeneutic works out Dasein's historicality ontologically as the ontical condition for the possibility of historiology, it contains the roots of what can be called "hermeneutic" only in a derivative sense: the methodology of these humane sciences which are historical in character. (p.62)

The question of Being, according to Heidegger, is rooted in the question of the givenness of the world to which I already belong. Dasein is understood only in terms of its world, because it is prior to any separation of self from world in the objective or cognitive sense. World is given along with Dasein prior to any act of conceptualizing. Thus, modes of Dasein, as Heidegger (1962) writes, "must be seen and understood *a priori* as grounded upon that state of Being which we have called Being-in-the-world" (p.78). This means that "world" has hermeneutical significance in providing and sustaining a given horizon of meaning.

For Heidegger, understanding is an existential matter and is prior to cognition. It is the power to grasp one's own possibilities for being, within the context of the lifeworld in which one exists. For Dasein is characterized by its understanding of Being, the meaning of Being can only

be interpreted from within this already existing understanding that is ontologically fundamental. Gadamer (1975) comments on Heidegger's concept of understanding:

> [For Heidegger] The concept of understanding is no longer a methodological concept, as with Droysen. Nor, as in Dilthey's attempt to provide a hermeneutical ground for the human science, is the process of understanding an inverse operation that simply follows behind life's tendency towards ideality. Understanding is the original character of the being of human life itself. (TM, p.230)

Understanding, as a fundamental existentiality that constitutes the disclosedness of Dasein, already contains in itself the possibility of interpretation, i.e., the appropriation of what is understood. Interpretation then is not "the acquiring of information about what is understood; it is rather the working out of possibilities projected in understanding" (Heidegger, 1962, pp.188-9). The interpretive function of understanding is not an additional something which is different from understanding itself, but is rather an explication of it.

It was already noted that we, in Heidegger's thinking, cannot conceive of Dasein apart from "world." For instance, in the world of carpenter, "wood" or "timber" is never "mere" wood or timber as a natural object of scrutiny, but acquires a given meaning from a given world. For Heidegger an interpretation is never presuppositionless; we come to an object with prior attitudes by virtue of which we can interpret it as something. Understanding and interpretation are grounded in something we have in advance. Heidegger(1962) says:

> An interpretation is never a presuppositionless apprehending of something pretended to us. If, when one is engaged in a particular concrete kind of interpretation, in the sense of exact textual interpretation, one likes to appeal to what "stands there," then one finds that what "stands there" in the first instance is nothing other than the obvious undiscussed assumption of the person who does the interpreting. In an interpretative approach there lies such an assumption, as that which has been "taken for granted" with the interpretation as such -that is to say, as that which has been presented in our fore-having, our fore-sight, and our fore-conception. (pp.191-2)

Heidegger asserts that in discourse, in talking, Dasein expresses itself. In discourse Dasein as Being-in-the-world is made known and indicated in language. The important point here is that Heidegger grounds all language not in words themselves or in abstract considerations about propositional logic, but in human life. This is the sense in which is found the familiar saying of Heidegger, "Language is the house of being" (cited in Palmer, 1969, p.135).

Heidegger's exposition of understanding and interpretation is really an ontological disclosure of human existing as we see in his famous dictum: "Knowledge is a mode of Dasein as Being-in-the-world." He tried to break away from the traditional subject-object schema which has dominated epistemology since the time of Descartes by going into the deeper ground of ontological Dasein. With Heidegger, as Gadamer (TM, p.234) sees, "the problem of hermeneutics gains a universal framework, even a new dimension, through his transcendental interpretation of understanding."

C. Gadamer's Philosophical Hermeneutics

Hermeneutics as a Philosophy of Understanding

The first German edition of Hans-Georg Gadamer's Truth and Method appeared in 1960 (English translation, 1975). As Richard Palmer (1969, p.217) notes, "Truth and Method opens up a whole new horizon of consideration in hermeneutical theory, perhaps heralding the beginning of a fruitful new stage in modern thinking about interpretation." Undoubtedly, Gadamer shares certain fundamental assumptions with Heidegger, but he is more systematic and less elusive than the thoughts of Heidegger. As Gadamer declares in the first paragraph of his introduction to Truth and Method, "the understanding and the interpretation of texts is not merely a concern of science, but is obviously part of the total human experience of the world" (TM, p.xi). Heidegger's reconception of understanding is made fully explicit with Gadamer. Hermeneutical tradition now becomes a philosophical effort to account for our understanding of what human beings are.

For this philosophical project, Gadamer, in the first part of Truth and Method, explores the relevance to hermeneutics of questions about truth and the experience of art by claiming that hermeneutics is ontological and universal. He strives to show how hermeneutics is closely interrelated with the entire history of humanistic studies by reviewing the leading humanistic concepts -*Bildung*

(culture), *sensus communis* (common sense), judgment, and taste. Gadamer's main concern here is with showing what is wrong with the radical "subjectivisation of aesthetics in the Kantian critique" (TM, p.39), and to set his antithesis between consciousness and the experience of art.

It is unnecessary for this study to follow closely his detailed arguments on "aesthetic consciousness," but he believes that the experience of art is not a matter of mere subjective consciousness, but of ontological disclosure of the experience of art. The work of art can never be reduced to the level of consciousness of any one individual in history, but always transcends it. It is not an object to be kept in a museum, "rather the work of art has its true being in the fact that it becomes an experience changing the person experiencing it. The subject of the experience of art, that which remains and endures, is not the subjectivity of the person who experiences it, but the work itself" (TM, p.92).

Although Gadamer begins with a discussion of works of art, it is not difficult to see the relevance of all this to hermeneutics. He moves, in the final section of the first part, to the question of the interpretation of texts, of history, of anything that is handed down to us through a living tradition. Interpretation, for him, is not a mere subjective recollection or mechanical reproduction of the past in the present, but a creative event in its own right. It constitutes the nature of "being present." "Hermeneutics

must be so determined as a whole that it does justice to the experience of art." Gadamer continues:

> Understanding must be conceived as a part of the process of the coming into being of meaning, in which the significance of all statements -those of art and those of everything else that has been transmitted- is formed and made complete. (TM, p.146)

Understanding and Prejudice

It was already noted that Heidegger has formulated a notion of presuppositionlessness in interpretation with his comments concerning "fore-having," "fore-sight," and "fore-conception." Gadamer accepts this formulation, and concretizes it into the conception of "prejudices" which constitutes a given "horizon of understanding." As Richard Bernstein (1983, p.127) notes, Gadamer's defence of prejudice is one of the boldest and most controversial aspects of philosophical hermeneutics.

Prejudice, in Gadamer, should not be made to bear the negative meaning. The negative consequence is the Enlightenment's "prejudice against prejudice itself," rather "prejudice means a judgment that is given before all the elements that determine a situation have been finally examined" (TM, p.240). Gadamer's insight on prejudice has two-fold meanings in the light of hermeneutics. On the one hand, his recognition that all understanding inevitably involves some prejudice gives the hermeneutical problem its real thrust; on the other hand, to risk and test his prejudices are a constant task for an interpreter. Gadamer

insists that:

> A person trying to understand a text is prepared for it to tell him something. That is why a hermeneutically trained mind must be, from the start, sensitive to the text's quality of newness. But this kind of sensitivity involves neither "neutrality" in the matter of the object nor the extinction of one's self, but the conscious assimilation of one's own fore-meaning and prejudices. The important thing is to be aware of one's own bias, so that the text may present itself in all its newness and thus be able to assert its own truth against one's own fore-meanings. (TM, p.238)

Prejudice, or pre-judgment, influences an interpreter through the tradition, the historically accumulated and historically operative basic structure, in which the interpreter stands. Tradition need no longer be seen as the enemy of reason and of rational freedom; it must be seen as an authoritative bridge between the past and the present which makes our prejudices "fruitful" presuppositions for understanding. Gadamer states:

> Understanding is not to be thought of so much as an action of one's subjectivity, but as the placing of oneself within a process of tradition, in which past and present are constantly fused. This is what must be expressed in hermeneutical theory, which is far too dominated by the idea of a process, a method. (TM, p.258)

It is important at this point to see how historical tradition or prejudices can make our understanding positive and productive. Gadamer claims that it is only possible to filter out the legitimate prejudices through a dialogue between the past and the present, between otherness and familiarity, that is initiated by the "temporal distance." Temporal distance, i.e., the temporality of our

prejudgments, is not something that must be overcome. It is one of the preconditions for our understanding. "It is only this temporal distance that can solve the really critical question of hermeneutics, namely of distinguishing the true prejudices, by which we understand, from the false ones by which we misunderstand" (TM, p.266). By this temporal distance the interpreter finds himself in his own situation from where he has to understand tradition by means of the prejudices. The hermeneutical task is then to find the resources in our language and experience to enable us to understand these initially alien phenomena without imposing blind or distortive prejudices on them (Bernstein, 1983, pp.141-2). This hermeneutically trained mind is what Gadamer terms "effective-historical consciousness" (TM, p.305).

Prejudices and prejudgments have a threefold temporal character: they are handed down to us through tradition; they are constitutive of what we are now; and they are always open to future transformation. Therefore, tradition is not something that stands over against an interpreter, but constitutes a horizon of meaning. Understanding is a fusion of two horizons, of both the interpreter and the prejudice which exists in the form of tradition. Genuine understanding takes place when there occurs a "fusion of horizons" between the past and the present, or between the text and the interpreter.

Gadamer further discusses that one's horizon is not closed and fixed, but moves according to a person who is

moving. This fact tells us that "our horizon of effective understanding is not one that we consciously acquire, but is rather an ongoing act of understanding" (Howard, 1982, p.152). This means again that "the discovery of the true meaning of a text or a work of art is never finished; it is in fact an infinite process" (TM, p.265).

Understanding and Language

For Gadamer, understanding and language are inseparable, because "language is the universal medium in which understanding itself is realised" (TM, p.350). The fusion of horizons is inconceivable without the medium of language, because the hermeneutical experience of tradition is not simply an event that an interpreter recognizes, but the language by which the tradition is made precise.

Gadamer finds a mediation of the two poles in language. Tradition brings itself to language ,and human consciousness is linguistic. This means that tradition comes to us in terms of language, and whatever the interpreter understands necessarily comes to speech in the medium of his or her language. Language, therefore, is a means in which "I" and "world" unite, or is a means in which text and interpreter have their original belongingness demonstrated.

Hermeneutical understanding is a language phenomenon in which the cultural tradition and the present horizons of the interpreter come into dialogue. "Past and present, text and interpretation, are part of an ongoing language process"

(Hoy, 1978, p.64). This is what Gadamer calls "the linguistic quality of understanding." Gadamer writes:

> All understanding is interpretation, and all interpretation takes place in the medium of a language which would allow the object to come into words and yet is at the same time the interpreter's own language. ... It is a genuine historical life-situation that takes place in the medium of language and that, also in the case of the interpretation of texts, we can call a conversation. The linguistic quality of understanding is the concretion of effective-historical consciousness. (TM, pp.350-1)

Gadamer's concern with language is not the same as with the naturalist perspective of language which sees language as a system of signs; rather he follows Humboldt's recognition that "language is not just one of man's possessions in the world, but on it depends the fact that man has a world at all" (TM, p.401). Language is by no means simply an instrument, a tool; it already brings a situation, or the subject-matter of a text, to disclosure.

One's use of language is inseparable from his or her world-view, i.e., how one understands him/herself and the world as a whole. If I am to see the world anew, a new language-event must take place which will break the bonds of my previous self-understanding. Whoever has language has the world. In other words, "to have a language is to be in the world" (Hoy, 1978, p.64). This is the ontological nature of language and its subject-matter. Gadamer writes in one of his essays (1976):

> In all our knowledge of ourselves and in all knowledge of the world, we are always already encompassed by the language that is our own. We grow up, and we become acquainted with men and in the

> last analysis with ourselves when we learn to speak. Learning to speak does not mean learning to use a preexistent tool for designating a world already somehow familiar to us; it means acquiring a familiarity and acquaintance with the world itself and how it confronts us. (pp.62-3)

Language, for Gadamer, has an intrinsically speculative structure. It is not fixed, but is always in process as the event of disclosure. Understanding does not mean merely projecting the interpreter's language into the text, nor simply finding the prior language of the interpreted text; it means coming into being of new subject-matter as language which transcends both of them through the dialogue between them. Hermeneutical understanding is a creative process in which the interpreter and the subject-matter are actively involved together with their languages to make possible a decision, choice, or valuation.

The problem of language presents the central issue of Gadamer's philosophical hermeneutics. His concern with language even marks the point where he transcends the limits of existential hermeneutics (Bleicher, 1980, p.115). Philosophical hermeneutics is no longer seen as a method of interpretation but as the way of interpretation itself. The focus is not given to an understanding of existence but to understanding language, more precisely, to understanding existence itself in terms of a language that addresses us from inside of it. Gadamer finally suggests the universality of language and hermeneutics.

> We can now see that this turn from the activity of the thing itself, from the coming into language of meaning, points to a universal ontological

> structure, namely to the basic nature of everything to which understanding can be directed. Being that can be understood is language. The hermeneutical phenomenon here draws into its own universality the nature of what is understood, by determining it in a universal sense as language, and its own relation to beings, as interpretation. (TM, pp.431-2).

Every understanding is inevitably language bound. There is nothing that is fundamentally excluded from being said, to the extent that our act of meaning intends it. Language is the real mark of human life as Gadamer (1976) writes:

> Language is the real medium of human being, if we only see it in the realm that it alone fills out, the realm of human being-together, the realm of common understanding, of ever-replenished common agreement -a realm as indispensible to human life as the air we breathe. (p.68)

The Function of Hermeneutical Reflection

Recognizing the universal phenomenon of human linguisticality, Gadamer transcends any kind of linguistic relativism, and comprehends that the mode of human experience in the world is basically hermeneutical. Understanding the meaning of dwelling in human existence, according to Gadamer (1976), is to "understand the language we use because we are always already biased in our thinking and knowing by our linguistic interpretation of the world" (p.64). The hermeneutical experience of the world does not consist of the calculation and measuring of what is present-at-hand, but is becoming aware of the meaning of being by unveiling what language means in human existence.

Since hermeneutics is precisely the way language itself is investigated, every attempt to understand something

through the relation of language and world involves a reflective dimension from the very beginning upon the process of understanding that attempts to clarify and make explicit the preunderstanding involved in the process. As a hermeneutical task, understanding requires an on-going reorganization of our experiences of the world. Understanding is never a mere act of repeating the same thing. The broadening and enrichment of our understanding are possible only through this kind of reflection, that is, hermeneutical reflection. According to Gadamer (1976):

> Hermeneutical reflection fulfills the function that is accomplished in all bringing of something to a conscious awareness. ... Only through hermeneutical reflection am I no longer unfree over against myself but rather can deem freely what in my preunderstanding may be justified and what unjustifiable. And also in this manner do I learn to gain a new understanding of what I have seen through eyes conditioned by prejudice. But this implies, too, that the prejudgments that lead my preunderstanding are also constantly at stake, right up to the moment of their surrender -which surrender could also be called a transformation. It is the untiring power of experience, that in the process of being instructed, man is ceaselessly forming a new preunderstanding. (p.38)

Gadamer conceives that hermeneutical reflection is engaging in a constant self-reflection attempting at self-understanding of the interpreter as well as what is interpreted. But, self-understanding does not mean a mere awareness of tradition in the normatively dogmatic way that some critics on Gadamer have understood. Rather, self-understanding demands the possibility of criticism; it requires a move to awareness of the relation between what is being said and what should be said.

This point is very crucial in understanding Gadamer's philosophy of hermeneutics. In fact, one of the most popular issues in contemporary disputes on hermeneutics is mainly concerned with the problem of hermeneutical reflection. For example, Habermas (1971), a leading scholar of Frankfurt School, has raised an objection to Gadamer by arguing that "historical-hermeneutical sciences are guided by a practical cognitive interest in self-understanding" (pp.309-310). In this case, "self-understanding" is assumed for Habermas to aim at "attaining possible consensus among actors in the framework of tradition" without having any critical element.

Habermas suspects Gadamer's theory of a lack of critical reflection on the ontological basis it derives from Heidegger. He claims his antithesis that "social action can only be comprehended in an objective framework that is constituted conjointly by language, labor, and domination" (Habermas, 1977, p.361). Consequently, Habermas and his followers think that hermeneutical reflection should be and could be developed into critical reflection. Hermeneutics, they believe, must be a critique of ideology aimed at the freeing of human emancipatory potential. Habermas (1977) states:

> Hermeneutic understanding is structurally oriented toward eliciting self-understanding of social groups. It makes possible a form of consensus on which communicative action depends. It eliminates the danger of a communication breakdown in two directions: vertically, in one's own tradition, and horizontally, in the mediation between traditions of different cultures and groups. (p.353)

Gadamer replies to his critics in several essays. He says that "the critique of ideology overestimates the competence of reflection and reason, and it is an idealistic bias on the other side which makes the critics believe the power of change in pure reflection" (1975b, p.315). Gadamer can accept the ideal of emancipation as continually generating new goals, and thus belonging to the step-by-step development of historical and social life because hermeneutical reflection means for Gadamer "always and unavoidably a step towards dissolving prior convictions" (1976, p.33).

Hermeneutical reflection itself instructs us that all tradition is based on commonly held views which one may call prejudices or dogmas. So it does not seem very rational to continue these prejudices by understanding tradition. If it is true that understanding in the sense of hermeneutical reflection means becoming aware of dominant prejudices, it would be a logical consequence to look critically at them. It can be said that every hermeneutical situation quite naturally opens up critical perspective. Gadamer (1979) makes a comment:

> It is grave misunderstanding to assume that emphasis on the essential factor of tradition which enters into all understanding implies an uncritical acceptance of tradition and sociopolitical conservatism. Whoever reads the present sketch of my hermeneutic theory will recognize that such an assumption reduces hermeneutics to an idealistic and historical self-conception. In truth the confrontation of our historic tradition is always a critical challenge of this tradition. (p.108)

In this respect, Paul Ricoeur, a French hermeneutical phenomenologist, rightly captures the problems of hermeneutical reflection. After examining both Gadamer's hermeneutical philosophy and Habermas' critique of ideology, Ricoeur sees the possibility of "a dialectic of the recollection of tradition and the anticipation of freedom in our tradition" (1981, p.100). In the course of hermeneutical dispute, therefore, it is necessary to recognize that hermeneutical philosophy contains a number of critical elements, and critique of ideology, too, must stand on the hermeneutical reinterpretation of tradition. Ricoeur (1973) questions: "Is it possible to distinguish and, even more so, to oppose the interest in emancipation and the practical interest still called in communication?" (pp.162-3)

Ricoeur's mediatory efforts arrive at the point that the disagreement between the hermeneutic of tradition and the critique of ideology concerns "the abyss which seems to separate simple misunderstanding from pathological or ideological distortion" (1981, p.97). He believes that the gap of mutual self-miscomprehension can only be fulfilled by emphasizing the complementary character of these two orders of sciences and the two modalities of interests. He (1973) demonstrates two things:

> First, that a hermeneutic of traditions can only fulfill its program if it introduces a critical distance, conceived and practiced as an integral part of the hermeneutic process. And, secondly, and on the other hand, that a critique of ideologies too can only fulfill its project if it incorporates a certain regeneration of the past, consequently, a reinterpretation of tradition. (pp.159-160)

Criticism implies distance, and the distance introduced by hermeneutical reflection makes possible new and deeper understanding. Hermeneutical reflection does not desire to change or eliminate every tradition; it can, in fact, indirectly serve the understanding of tradition by making transparently clear the guiding preunderstandings in the tradition and thereby open new dimensions of questioning. "The real power of hermeneutical consciousness is our ability to see what is questionable" (Gadamer, 1976, p.13). With this hermeneutical reflection,

> the real event of understanding goes beyond what we can bring to the understanding of the other people's words through methodical effort and critical -control. Indeed, it goes far beyond what we ourselves can become aware of. (Gadamer, 1976, p.58)

D. Considerations for the Research Approach

Understanding, or hermeneutics, is not a matter of mere technique in the narrower sense of the term. It transcends mere method as Gadamer understands it. Consequently, Gadamer's work, Truth and Method, as he explicitly expresses, is not attempting to give any technique or methodological rules of understanding; it asks only a basic philosophic question: How is understanding possible? (TM, pp.xvi-xviii)

In spite of the above recognition, it is also conceived that Gadamer's understanding of philosophical hermeneutics gives strong suggestions for not only the philosophical background but also the methodological considerations of

this study. To clarify the latter aspect, I must undertake a supplementary discussion of some of Gadamer's additional concepts in terms of their implications for the research approach of this study. Those concepts are: hermeneutical questioning, hermeneutical circle, hermenetical application, and translation.

Hermeneutical Questioning

Engaging in a hermeneutical inquiry, particularly in the case of this study, is to disclose meanings in written texts, and to find language that captures these meanings. In hermeneutical understanding, meanings are the sense of a text; what the text speaks about. But, meanings are not merely the contents of the text; they are rather what the tradition intends to speak through the text. Meanings are thus not only the appearances which are expressed on the lines but also hidden intentions and assumptions which can be read behind or between the lines. Meanings are more like "knots in the web" of the text (Van Manen, 1984a, p.59).

In this sense, the nature of hermeneutical understanding is in sharp contrast to the positivistic analysis of a text aiming at finding facts and causal relations. While the positivists seek to describe the meaning of a text from what it denotes rather than what it connotes, hermeneutical understanding moves from the text's surface meaning to its latent deep meaning. To reach this kind of deep understanding, it is required to capture the

hermeneutical logic of question and answer. Gadamer suggests:

> A person who seeks to understand must question what lies behind what is said. He must understand it is an answer to a question. If we go back behind what is said, then we inevitably ask questions beyond what is said. (TM, p.333)

That a text is interpreted, according to the hermeneutical logic of question and answer, means that it presents a question to the interpreter. To understand a text is to understand the question of the text. The text itself in this sense is an answer to the question it asks. The meaning of a text is thus relative to the question to which the text is an answer. The interpreter does not come as an empty vessel, either; s/he also brings a question to the text with a horizon of meaning which is formed by his or her own tradition. The understanding of a text is, in a part, bound up with how the interpreter questions it, and that question places the text within a particular perspective or horizon. The meaning of a text is thus neither simply the objective author's intention, nor a product of the interpreter's conscious reflection. It emerges from the creative, not merely reproductive, process of interrogation. The possibility of a fusion of horizons is based on this hermeneutical logic of question and answer.

The meanings of a text are closely related to the questions and answers the text and the interpreter bring into the interpretive situation. An interpreter, therefore, has to bring the text into a dialogue with him or her if

s/he attempts to hear what the text says rather than merely projecting his or her own ideas into the text. Thus, hermeneutics has two tasks: that of situating the text to be interpreted within the situational context, and of reinterpreting the situation and boundaries of the interpreter him/herself.

All forms of hermeneutical interpretation can be comprehended as "a two-bladed knife, cutting both ways" (Aoki, 1980, p.13), bringing into consciousness formerly unconscious meanings of both of text and interpreter. Interpreting a text is inevitably concerned with the disclosure of hidden meaning, and with the demystifying of false consciousness. It involves a true awareness of the world and of the interpreter him/herself which in turn deepen and broaden his or her understanding, that is, self-understanding. The meaning of a text is the product of this self-understanding.

Hermeneutical Circle

In hermeneutical inquiry, the interpretation of meaning is characterized by a "hermeneutical circle" in which "we must understand the whole in terms of the detail and the detail in terms of the whole" (TM, p.258). The meaning of a text emerges and is determined through this process, where the meanings of the separate parts are determined by the global meaning of a text, as it is anticipated. The closer determination of the meanings of the separate parts may, then

to change the originally anticipated meaning of the totality, and this again influences the meanings of the separate parts.

This circle of understanding is not only a concern of the procedure of interpretation, but also directs an interpreter to have sensitive dialogue with the text s/he interprets. The hermeneutical circle "describes understanding as the interplay of the movement of tradition and the movement of the interpreter" (TM, p.261). Through this circle of understanding, the interpreter clarifies his or her prejudgments and opens new perspectives to the text by which it is possible to go beyond given limitations.

In principle, such a hermeneutical explication of a text is an ever-renewing attempt to interpret meaning and develop better understanding, while, in practice, it ends when one has reached a sensible meaning, a valid unitary meaning which is free of inner contradictions. "The harmony of all the details with the whole is the criterion of correct understanding" (TM, p.259).

There is no determinate method for acquiring and pursuing understanding in the sense of explicit rules that are to be followed. Or we might say that rules function only as heuristic guides for understanding. Methodologically, however, Kvale(1984, pp.186-7) depicts seven canons for the interpretation of meaning within the mode of hermeneutical understanding. Here is a brief summary: The first canon involves the continuous back and forth process between the

parts and the whole which follows from the hermeneutical circle. Starting with a vague and intuitive understanding of the text as a whole, one then goes back to certain themes and special expressions, tries to develop their meaning, and then returns to the more global meaning. A second canon is that an interpretation of meaning ends when one has reached a good *Gestalt*, or the inner unity in the text, which is free of logical contradictions. A third canon is the testing of the interpretations in the parts against the global meaning of the text. A fourth canon is the autonomy of the text; the text should be understood on the basis of itself, by explicating what the text itself states about a theme. A fifth canon is that interpreting a text requires for the interpreter to have an extensive knowledge of the themes of the text. He must consider the different nuances of meaning in the text, and the different connections they may enter into. A sixth principle is that interpretation of a text is not presuppositionless. What matters here is to be as aware as possible about one's presuppositions and mode of influence, and to attempt to take them into account in the interpretation. A seventh canon states that every interpretation involves innovation and creativity. The interpretation here transcends the immediately given and enriches understanding of meaning.

Hermeneutical Application

That a hermeneutical inquiry involves not only an explication of a text but also a critical examination of the tradition which makes understanding deeper and broader has been continuously discussed throughout the chapter. For Gadamer, too, this is one of the fundamental hermeneutic problems in terms of hermeneutical application.

Gadamer holds that application is integral to the whole experience of understanding a text. Against an older tradition that divided up hermeneutics into understanding, interpretation, and application, a primary thesis of Gadamer's work is to show that these are not three independent activities to be relegated to different subtleties, but rather they are "one unified process, the single process of understanding" (TM, p.275). Gadamer illustrates this principle from the area of legal hermeneutics. Understanding in the area of law, far from constituting an exceptional problem in hermeneutics, actually provides a paradigm case of what understanding a text involves. The jurist understands and interprets the meaning of a law, or a legal text, for the sake of a present legal case. "Understanding here is always application" (TM, p.275).

Understanding is not a theoretical activity, in which the interpreter scrutinizes a text before him or her as a passive object. Understanding a text must involve more than [illegible] exploration of its meaning. This is why Gadamer

calls hermeneutics a "practical philosophy." Gadamer (1981) argues:

> Understanding, like action, always remains a risk and never leaves room for the simple application of a general knowledge of rules to the statements or text to be understood. Furthermore, where it is successful, understanding means a growth in inner awareness, which as a new experience enters into the texture of our own mental experience. Understanding is an adventure...." (p.109, emphasis mine)

Interpreting a text naturally requires an intelligent reading that involves its application. It requires for the interpreter the widest possible range of perspectives, of present patterns of resolution, alternative possibilities, the origins of present patterns and of proposals of alternatives, and the consequences of present and alternative patterns. As s/he seeks out alternative possibilities through examining the origins and consequences of the acts and of the situations in which the text is situated, his or her present concern and viewpoint are transformed into a greater and deeper understanding of the meaning.

Translation and Interpretation

According to Gadamer's claim to the universal character of human linguisticality, all human understanding becomes a language phenomenon, because "language is the fundamental mode of operation of our being-in-the-world and the all-embracing form of the contribution of the world" (Gadamer, 1976, p.3). In terms of language, this study has a

translation. I am writing this dissertation in what for me is a second language, English, which is not my own mother-tongue. And, as will be described in the next chapter, the subject of this study is a series of Korean documents. Therefore, conducting this study requires not only interpreting the documents for understanding but also translating the interpreted into a language other than the one the documents use.

One can easily imagine that translation is not a work of merely changing a language into that of another. If one only replaces the words and sentences spoken by a foreign language into his or her own, the translated language can hardly have any meaning, and thus alienates the conversation into unintelligibility. None of the translators can simply convert what is said out of a foreign language into his or her own without comprehending the meaning of what is said. This means the work of translation itself is a process of interpretation and understanding. Gadamer states:

> The translation process contains the whole secret of human understanding of the world and of social communication. Translation is an indivisible unity of implicit anticipation, of presumption of meaning in general and of the explicit determination of what one presumed. (TM, p.497)

When one translates a foreign language into one's own, one may hope to preserve the same concepts and meaning. But, if one thinks that translation is simply a matter of replacing one set of words for another, can the conceptual continuity be preserved? For example, Koreans can say "Be a

"su-sung"' with "teacher" mechanically, does the sentence have any meaning in English? For what has to be translated is not a wooden repetition of certain phrases, but a nexus of words-in-context whose total context spreads out from its immediate linguistic expression into the wider field of the historical and cultural situation in which the language is embedded. Gadamer (1976) also says:

> The task of the translator, therefore, must never be a copy of what is said, but to place himself in the direction of what is said (i.e., in its meaning), in order to carry over what is to be said into the direction of his own saying. (p.68)

The task of this study, then, becomes that of double interpretation: the interpretation of the texts and the re-interpretation of the interpreted in the course of translation. Through this double process, it is hoped that the meaning of the texts becomes clearer, and the understanding of the texts becomes deeper.

Hermeneutics is not only a method of interpretation but also a philosophy of understanding, of human life itself. The fundamental human quest is the search for meaning, and the basic human capacity for this search is experienced in the hermeneutical process, the process of interpretation of text, work of art, human action, even world. This is the search for a better understanding that motivates and satisfies us. Hermeneutics, thus, is not only the method of this study but also the philosophical background upon which this study is based.

' The meaning of the term is discussed in chapters II and

Chapter IV

THE INSTITUTIONAL AND CURRICULAR CONTEXTS OF THE TEXTS

A. Introduction

We are making an endeavor to come to a deeper understanding of the meaning of teacher competence. The discussion of hermeneutics in the previous chapter has shown us what the nature of human understanding is, and how we can reach a deeper understanding of human experience through a dialogue with a text. The discussion also suggests that an inquiry searching for an understanding of meaning should not be an abstract argument; it must be based upon a concrete instance of lived world, human experiences, texts, or whatever else, within which our "traditions" or "prejudicies" are to be understood.

Based on this reason, this study takes the form of concrete study in order to understand how the term "teacher competence" is understood in Korean teacher education. The study plans to do this by way of interpreting a series of textbooks in a teacher education curriculum in Korea. Those textbooks are considered in this study as a "text" of Korean teacher education.

It has been discussed that an interpretation of a text requires consideration of its own context, that is, putting the text in its own situation. Teacher education is closely related to society's understanding of the roles of education. Changes in the roles of education reflect

societal changes, and are reflected in the mode of teacher education. Hence, a teacher education program cannot be conceived independently of its historical and societal contexts.

Thus, this chapter is designed to set out briefly historical and situational contexts in which is placed the teacher education curriculum to be understood in this study. A portrayal of the institutional context and the curricular context of Korean teacher education is provided as they now exist with a description of the curriculum documents selected for the interpretation in this study.

B. The Curriculum Documents as Text

To prevent the study becoming an abstract argument, and to make questions emerge from actual commitments based on a concrete situation, I have selected a series of documents from a teacher education curriculum in Korea. These are the textbooks for the professional courses which are required for an elementary teacher certificate. All of them were written by The Compilation Committees for Elementary Teacher Education Textbooks'[9], and are or were used in all eleven elementary teacher education institutions in Korea.

In an educational program for teachers, one can recognize the rich possibilities for inquiring into its view of teacher, specifically its understanding of the meaning of

---

[9] The committees were organized according to the subject areas or courses, and consisted of professors commissioned from the eleven teachers' colleges in each area.

teacher competence. The teacher education program is the place where the notions and images that form teacher education are discussed as well as practiced. In this sense, it is a "text" in a hermeneutical sense in which its "tradition" and "prejudices" are embedded. The curriculum documents selected for this study are in the same case. They are not only literally texts but also a "text" which can represent the "tradition" and "prejudices" of Korean teacher education.

The titles'' of the selected materials are listed below:

* Curriculum and Instruction in Elementary School Moral Education
* Curriculum and Instruction in Elementary School Language Education
* Curriculum and Instruction in Elementary School Social Studies Education
* Curriculum and Instruction in Elementary School Mathematics Education
* Curriculum and Instruction in Elementary School Science Education
* Curriculum and Instruction in Elementary School Music Education
* Curriculum and Instruction in Elementary School Visual Arts Education

---

'' In the following chapters, the titles of these curriculum materials will be cited as shortened forms such as Moral Education, Social Studies, etc..

* Curriculum and Instruction in Elementary School Physical Education
* Curriculum and Instruction in Elementary School Practical Arts Education
* The Foundations of Education
* Child Development and Guidance
* Curriculum and Instruction
* School and Community

There are several reasons why I have selected these materials to understand teacher education in Korea. First of all, the courses which use these textbooks are the main part of the elementary teacher education curriculum. These are called professional courses and form about two-thirds of the total credits.

Secondly, these courses are compulsory for all prospective elementary teachers. Among those listed above, the first nine documents are the textbooks for the subject-related curriculum and instruction courses, and the latter four documents are the educational foundation courses. Because there are nine subject areas in elementary schools in Korea, student teachers are expected to study all of these nine courses with four foundation courses on philosophy and history of education, educational psychology, educational sociology, and general theories of curriculum and teaching.

Lastly, these documents are used most widely for teacher education. All eleven teachers' colleges use these

materials as textbooks. Although the new program of the four-year system has been applied in some part, the texts for the new courses have not been prepared at the point of this research, and much will not be changed in the content of these professional courses. Thus, it is assumed that these textbooks reflect more clearly than other materials the notion of teacher competence which has been embedded in Korean teacher education. More detailed description will be clarified by considering the institutional and curricular contexts where these documents are placed.

C. The Institutional Context

Korea has a relatively long history. In traditional Korean society, education had been conducted mainly at private village schools where a small group of pupils were taught Chinese classics by classical scholars. Education was limited to the boys of the aristocratic class, and teachers were men of high learning and moral repute.

With the new ideas in education evoked in the latter part of the nineteenth century by the opening of the gate to Western countries, a modern public school system was established in Korea at the beginning of this century. The first formal teacher education institution was established at this time (1895).

Unfortunately, this new education movement was interrupted by Japanese colonial rule (1910-1945), even though several teacher education schools were opened in

imitation of the Japanese school system during the colonial period. These schools aimed at educating elementary school teachers by providing secondary school level education.

Since liberation from colonial rule in 1945, considerable changes have taken place in every field. School education was subject to various changes in its system, content and ideology. Social changes not only gave birth to new values in education, but also defined the institutional system and the contents of pre-service and in-service education for teachers as a normative need and professional requirement.

At this time, the teacher education institutions were re-established and divided into two different systems: a system of colleges of education'[2] for secondary school teacher education and a system of teachers' schools for elementary teacher education. The colleges of education were founded at the level of two-year junior college or four-year university education, while the teachers' schools were that of upper secondary school. The education of secondary school teachers was open to both of public and private institutions, but the elementary teacher education was limited to public (government-founded) schools only. This principle has been kept until now.

'[2] It is difficult to distinguish the differences between college of education and teachers' college or teachers' school in English. These terms are used in the Korean context, that is, college of education refers to secondary school teacher education institutions, and teachers' college refers to elementary teacher education institutions of college level while teachers' school refers to that of secondary school level.

Korean society changed continuously throughout the 1950's and 1960's. In Korea, this period was characterized by: (1) an unrestrained introduction of Western culture in the wake of the adoption of democracy after the liberation; (2) the migration of the population on account of the Korean War (1950-1953); (3) economic development accelerated by the occasion of the student uprising (1960) and military revolution (1961); and (4) the propagation and development of education achieved during this period.

In spite of considerable changes expected to take place in the educational system[13], content and methodology of education[14], no one can deny that success or failure in education depends heavily upon the quality of teachers. The rapid modernization of Korean society and the increase in the educational standard led people to expect that in order to improve the qualification of teachers, the education of teachers must be at a level higher than upper secondary school. Accordingly, in 1962, teachers' schools were reorganized into teachers' colleges which gave a teacher education program equivalent to a two-year junior college level education. About this time, many graduate schools of education opened the gates for the continuing education of secondary school teachers.

Although temporary teacher education institutions were operated from time to time by the rapidly increasing demand

---

[13] The basic school system of 6-3-3-4 was established in 1951.

[14] The first formal school curricula were made in 1955, and revised in 1963, 1973 and 1983.

in the number of teachers, an endeavor to raise the quality of teachers has been attempted continuously. In 1980, the Fifth Republic decided to raise the status of teachers' colleges equivalent to a four-year university education, and implemented this plan from 1981 to 1984.

Two things should be added here. First, in 1981, the Air and Correspondence College, originally established in 1972, expanded its structure from a two-year junior college into a five-year system. The Department of Elementary Education in this college is expected to make an important contribution to the in-service education for elementary school teachers through air and correspondence education. Secondly, with the increasing awareness of the importance of teacher education, the government decided to found a national teachers' university which is anticipated to take a pivotal role in teacher education. This university was opened in the spring of 1985.

In the current educational system in Korea, teacher education routes are manifold. One can become a teacher through a college of education, teachers' college, department of education attached to a university or college, or education courses opened at a college. But, the mainstays in teacher education are the colleges of education for secondary school teachers and the teachers' colleges for elementary school teachers. They play a central part not only in pre-service but also in in-service education for teachers (cf. Table 1).

Table 1. Institutions for Teacher Education*

Classification	Schools	Number of Schools N	P	T	Freshman Quota
Elementary School Teacher	Teachers Colleges	11	-	11	5,520
	Air and Co. College	1	-	1	5,000**
	Education Department	-	1	1	50
Secondary School Teacher	Colleges of Education	10	25	35	13,845
	Education Departments	7	35	42	4,470
	Education Courses	18	62	80	91,600***
	Graduate Schools of Education	10	22	32	2,957

N: national, P: private, T: total
* Educational Statistics(1982), Korean Ministry of Education.
** All students are incumbent teachers.
*** To be certificated does not guarantee to be appointed as teacher. The graduates of national colleges of education have priority for appointment in public schools.

While the preparation of secondary school teachers has a relative diversity, the preparation program of elementary school teachers is monopolized by the eleven teachers' colleges founded by the national government. The school structure and curriculum of the teachers' colleges, therefore, are strongly influenced by the governmental guide.

D. The Curricular Context

In the industrialization endeavors of Korea, the greatest emphasis has been placed on economic development, while making a commensurate effort for the development of science and technology. Educational policies pursued by the government during the past three decades also concentrated on the propagation of educational opportunities and the economical development of the nation.

On the other hand, the discontinuities in its history caused by the colonial period and the flood of Western disciplines introduced after the liberation made it difficult for Korean educators to establish their own philosophy. Curriculum decision-making, thus, has been strongly influenced by both national needs and foreign thoughts, especially American educational thoughts.

The current structure of the university curriculum has been established after the liberation, and consisted of general courses designed for liberal education and major courses which are directly concerned with intensive specialization in separate disciplines. The teacher education curriculum has also been developed introducing the concept of professional education within the basic framework of the university curriculum.

As reviewed previously, a controversial issue concerning the relative weight given to liberal art education versus professional education has been the question of our concern in teacher education (Borrowman,

1956; 1965). In Korea, too, there have been sporadic debates between the members of colleges of education and colleges of humanities on this issue. The issue has been largely concerned with the question whether a teacher should be a subject specialist or an educational professional.

A closely related dispute has involved a question of who should teach the subject major courses in education. In many cases, colleges of education in Korea have their own courses for subject content study independently from other colleges according to the secondary school subject areas. Whereas professors of education who have opted to teach these courses for the greater part have been successful in their effort, it is true that some of the courses, except teaching methodology and material courses, overlap with the courses offered by other colleges. Thus, some professors of arts and sciences have at times proposed to abolish colleges of education

In the case of elementary teacher education, it had been an upper high school and a two-year junior college program until 1980. Given such a short term of preparation, an immediate concern was with the provision of a bare minimum of liberal education and professional knowledge and skills.

Although changes occurred and are occurring in the teacher education curriculum in Korea, the common feature of the teacher education curriculum today reflects the categories of general education, professional education,

subject matter education, and practice teaching. The curriculum of secondary school teacher education gives much emphasis on subject knowledge because a secondary school teacher teaches only one subject area in school (cf. Table 2), while the elementary teacher education curriculum places much weight on educational foundations and curriculum and instruction courses in all subject areas which are taught in elementary schools (cf. Table 3).

Table 2. Credit Allotment for Secondary School Teacher Education*

Course Groups	Minimum Credits**
General Courses	
Required	17
Electives	27-34
Educational Foundation Courses	15
Practice Teaching	2
Subject Major Courses (including teaching method)	72-79
Total	140

* This is the case of The College of Education, Seoul National University. Other colleges of education are similar to this framework.
** 1 credit means 1 hour study per week through 16 weeks.

Table 3. Credit Allotment for Elementary School Teacher Education (2 year program)

Course Groups	Minimum Credits
General Courses	25-29
Professional Courses	
Educational Foundation Courses	15
Curriculum and Instruction Courses	35
Practice Teaching	2
Electives	6-8
Total	83-89

The elementary teacher education curriculum is being changed now according to the changes in the system shifting from a two year program to a four-year program. Some of the teachers' colleges have started to apply the new curriculum of a four-year system with their freshmen. 1987 is the targetted date for the completion of the changes in the curriculum. Although there are eleven national teachers' colleges in Korea, there is little difference among their curricula, because the government sets a standard for the elementary teacher education curriculum. The new curriculum for a four-year program of elementary teacher education has also been proposed by the governmental education department (cf. Table 4).

Table 4. Credit Allotment for Elementary School Teacher Education (4 year program)

Course Groups	Minimum Credits
General Courses	
Basics	31
Foreign Language	8
Humanities	4
Social Sciences	4
Natural Sciences	4
Arts	2
Professional Courses	
Educational Foundation Courses	22
Curriculum, Instruction Courses	42
Practice Teaching	4
Advanced Study in a Subject Area	21
Electives	3-8
Total	145-150

Furthermore, the requirements are manifested in the law that the university curriculum must allot at least one-third of the total credits to general education (including National Ethics, Korean History, Korean Language, Physical Education, and Military Drill as required courses), and that the teacher preparation program must include a minimum of fifteen credits in professional courses. Since the law has binding force, it exerts so profound an impact on the program of teacher education that it may be considered as an important determinant in the quality of teachers. Many colleges and universities thus offer education courses for the students who want to have teaching certificates. Consequently, it has been held that anyone can be a teacher if s/he takes several education courses in addition to his or her major subject study.

Another important issue in teacher education which deserves our concern is internship or student teaching. There is a world-wide trend in teacher education to extend the time for practical experiences with children in schools because student teaching has come to be acknowledged as a key element of any teacher education program. In most cases of pre-service teacher education in Korea, practice teaching lasts a few (4 or 6) weeks, and some teacher educators argue that this is a factor that impairs the effectiveness of teacher education. Some colleges are planning to require students to do eight weeks actual practice which consists of observation of schools, teaching practice and administrative

practice as a part of the four-year elementary teacher education program.

In Korea, there has been an incessant effort to extend the duration of the initial preparation of teachers and to improve the teacher education program. There is, however, no reliable evidence measuring the impact of the duration of teacher preparation on the quality of teachers. It reflects the fact that the concern of what is being taught to prospective teachers is no less important than the duration of teacher preparation. What is more radical is the concealed understanding within which a teacher education curriculum has under the titles of courses as to what the competent teacher is.

Chapter V

INTERPRETING THE TEXTS OF A TEACHER EDUCATION CURRICULUM

A. Introduction

Based on our discussions in the previous chapters, this chapter seeks to understand the meaning of teacher competence as it is revealed in Korean elementary teacher education through an interpretation of the curriculum texts which have been selected for this study and described in the previous chapter. We already have an insight from Gadamer as to what it is like to interpret a text hermeneutically, and how it is different from the traditional content analysis of a text. Gadamer (1976b; 1980) shows us in his own hermeneutical studies on Plato and Hegel how a hermeneutical interpretation of a text promises deeper understanding by making new questions possible. We can find his concerted effort to shift the focus of discussion away from techniques and methods of interpretation to the clarification of understanding as an ~~event~~ that in its very nature is a deliberate act of self-conscious reflection.

As an interpretive research which seeks a deeper understanding of the meaning of teacher competence, this chapter intends to search for meaning rather than the overt factual content of the texts. Rather than seeking the author's intentions or imposing predefined meanings of the interpreter, what will be safeguarded is the integrity of the texts. The idea of "integrity of a text" does not mean

the isolation of the text as an object over against the interpretive act. Rather, it means that the text exists in its own presentation as possibilities for disclosure. The real meaning of a text goes beyond either the author's intention and the interpreter's subjective feeling. Thus, a dialogue between the texts and the researcher is encouraged to allow meaning to emerge from within this dialogue as we seek to understand what the texts mean.

According to the considerations for the research approach discussed in chapter three, interpreting the texts begins with an initial reading of the texts as a whole. This initial reading is expected to yield an initial understanding of the texts: what the texts say and what questions they ask. Therefore, the first task in interpreting the texts is to reveal interpretive questions which will guide the act of interpretation, and allow the dialogue between the texts and the researcher to happen, as a bridge between the two in an endeavour to understand what teacher competence really means.

It was said that understanding as a fusion of horizons is essentially a linguistic process. Indeed, these two -language and understanding of meaning- are not two processes, but are affirmed by Gadamer as one and the same. The meaning of a text is mirrored and disclosed by language. The language of a text addresses something through the written expressions, but at the same time conceals a part of meaning within the language. Interpreting a text is to "fill

out what is said to a totality of meaning and make what is said really said" (Gadamer, 1975, p.445).

The next task is then to find significant sayings from the texts in terms of the interpretive questions identified, and to question again what they really mean. This is the task of disclosing what is unsaid in the texts with relation to the whole of meaning that is concealed in what is said. This is the very task of understanding the meaning of teacher competence. In this part, I will try to reveal the texts' understanding of teacher competence by questioning the meanings of four basic conceptions in teacher education: education, curriculum, teaching, and human knowing. In exposing the limitations of the forestructures of the texts' understanding, we are expected to become open to new investigation, and to be able to extend our horizon of understanding.

As it is believed that understanding something is a self-reflective act aiming at demystifying false consciousness, an initial reflection on the interpretation of the texts follows as the last part of the chapter, which will try to reveal hidden assumptions and rationalities embedded in the texts' understanding of teacher competence. A more fundamental reflection on the whole process of the study will constitute the next chapter.

There can be no final end in our act of understanding. The "truth" of the meaning of teacher competence may be far from our reach. This interpretation may be a small part of

the endless effort to deepen our understanding a step further.

B. Revealing Interpretive Questions

It has been discussed that a hermeneutical interpretation of a text is possible through a dialogue between the questions and answers the text and an interpreter bring into an interpretive situation. In attempting to interpret the teacher education curriculum texts, the researcher's fundamental questions are: How do the texts understand the meaning of teacher competence? How should the meaning of teacher competence be understood?

Since the thirteen texts selected for this study are the teaching materials of the main courses in the elementary teacher education curriculum in Korea, it might be natural for the interpreter to expect that the texts have an answer to the question of teacher competence. In the "Preface" of a text, this expectation is confirmed by the following sentence:

> In writing this text, the authors tried to emphasize the practical problems of teaching the subject rather than theoretical debates in the field in order to help teachers to conduct their teaching effectively, and thus to improve the quality or competence of teachers. (Moral Education, p.i, emphasis mine)[13]

But, none of the thirteen texts deals explicitly with the question of what teacher competence means or what the competent teacher is. Most of them are concerned with what

---

[13] Hereafter, all quotations from the Korean curriculum texts are my own translations.

student teachers are expected to know and do in order to teach children each subject area. They are directed toward teaching practice and the specification of the language with which student teachers are to talk about the teaching of their specialization.

This does not mean, however, that the texts are not concerned with the question of teacher competence. It is impossible to discuss subject-matter teaching without implying some understandings as to what teaching is, or what the competent teacher is. In fact, an implicit idea in every text is that prospective teachers are expected to know what the text says in order to be competent teachers. This is to say that the texts may discuss the question of teacher competence in a different way from that of the researcher's.

In a conversation, if I talk of chalk, and you talk of cheese, we cannot continue the conversation anymore. In lived conversation, however, we can ask a question again, and correct one's way of answering. But, conversation with texts is different. "Texts are permanently fixed expressions of life which have to be understood" (Gadamer, 1975, p.349). We cannot impose our way of questioning upon the texts. Here, we need a real dialogue with the texts. One way to smoothen the dialogue with the texts is to follow the texts' way of questioning and answering, while trying to allow the texts to speak of the interpreter's concern, teacher competence. Then, what questions do the curriculum texts try to answer in considering the education of prospective

teachers?

When we consider Gadamer's understanding that "what is said is an answer to a question" (1975, p.333), what is said in the curriculum texts is their answers to certain questions. Although the texts do not address their questions explicitly, the questions are already embedded in their answers. One way to reveal these hidden questions is to refer to the topics dealt with in the formats and designs of the texts because they are the ways in which what the texts say is organized. The texts select their topics among various alternatives, and say something, i.e., their understanding as to the topics. Thus, we can interpret them as the texts' understanding of what questions must be asked, and of what are and are not important in considering teacher education as well as their answers to the questions.

At first glance, one finds that the thirteen textbooks have a similar format and design, and also use similar language. It is not necessary to list all the formats and contents of the thirteen textbooks in order to demonstrate this finding. Let me take only one example which is considered as representative of the other texts.

The text, Curriculum and Instruction in Elementary School Language Education, covers three hundred and eighty-nine pages, and consists of six chapters. The titles of the chapters are:

1. The Basic Concepts of Language Education
2. The Curriculum of Language Education

3. Teaching Methods in Language Education
4. Studies on Teaching Materials
5. The Evaluation of Language Education
6. The History of Language Education in Korea

The first chapter begins by defining language and language education, and discusses problems and tasks in language education as an introduction. The second chapter portrays the elementary school language curriculum giving full descriptions and examples of the objectives and contents of the curriculum. The third chapter deals with various methods for teaching language in schools. After discussing general theories of teaching methods, the rest of the chapter intends to guide the student teachers in making lesson plans. In chapter four, the text analyzes and discusses the language textbooks which are being used in elementary schools. The fifth chapter displays the methods, techniques and procedures of evaluation in language education. The final chapter introduces the historical changes of language education since the beginning of modern formal education in Korea.

Although the concrete contents of the texts differ from each other according to the subject area concerned, the topics and their organization of the other texts are not much different from the above example, Some texts divide each of the volumes into two parts: the knowledge of the subject-matter and teaching the subject, and the educational foundation texts have their own areas. But the texts are

mostly concerned with five topics: the concept of education, school curriculum, teaching methods, knowledge of the subject-matter concerned, and evaluation of learning results.

Although each of the above topics can be transformed into a form of question, it does not tell us directly the way in which the question should be asked. There are two aspects in making a question. One aspect is the content of the question, and the other is the way of questioning. People may ask different questions about a same topic according to their ways of understanding the topic. In this sense, to understand a text means to understand the ways in which the text asks its questions. Understanding the text's way of questioning in turn makes it possible to ask a deeper question: How should the question be asked? This is "the logic of the question itself."

From an interpreter's situation, therefore, the above topics can be translated into the following four interpretive questions (evaluation of learning results is considered as a part of curricular discussion):

1. How is education understood?
2. How is curriculum understood?
3. How is teaching understood?
4. How is human knowing understood?

Are these questions essentially different from the researcher's fundamental question: How do the texts understand the meaning of teacher competence? We cannot

inquire the question of teacher competence without considering the meanings of the above four basic concepts in teacher education. If someone tries to understand the meanings of these words, s/he is simultaneously answering the question of what teacher competence is.

Therefore, in attempting to interpret the texts in order to understand the meaning of teacher competence, I will try to disclose the ways in which the above four questions are answered by the texts. The texts' understanding of the meaning of teacher competence will be illuminated from the ways in which the texts understand the above key-words in teacher education.

C. Understanding the Meaning of Teacher Competence

Instrumental Understanding of Education and Teacher Competence

What is education? If asked, one may try to answer the question by referring to a simplified theoretical position s/he prefers, or one may answer by saying his or her own educational experiences. But, we soon realize that the answers are not something that can be tested empirically in terms of right or wrong. Answering the question is neither a matter of deducing conclusions from axioms which are themselves not subjects for investigation, nor a process which is used to make judgments and predictions about the material world. It is concerned with the clarity and the

pertinence of the reflective claims we make about the experiences we have. It is a matter of our understanding.

Then, how do the teacher education curriculum texts understand "education"? What are their prejudices that allow this kind of understanding? Within this understanding of education, how is the teacher viewed? How is the meaning of teacher competence understood?

As textbooks for the teaching profession courses of a teacher education curriculum, it is quite natural for the texts to begin each of the texts with a discussion of education. One of the texts begins its discussion of education with the etymological origin of the word education in Korean. In Chinese characters, the Koreans use the word "敎育 (kyo-yuk)" to denote education. Every Chinese character has a meaning in itself. In this case, "敎(kyo)" means "teaching" or "pointing," and "育(yuk)" means "bringing up" or "nurturing." The text interprets the original meaning of the word, "kyo-yuk" as:

> "Kyo" means guiding children to learn something by having a pointer in hand, and "yuk" means helping children to grow up as good persons by cultivating good deeds. By "having a pointer in hand" is meant teaching, and by "cultivating good deed" is meant nurturing. Thus, "kyo-yuk" means teaching and nurturing. (The Foundations, pp.14-5)

The etymological origin of the word shows us a possible way of interpreting the word. But, it does not tell us directly the ways in which the word is understood in a society at a particular point in time. Knowing the origin of a word does not ensure one's understanding of the word. We

need another venture. The text recommends to student teachers:

> Students who want to understand the meaning of education must apply themselves to have their own meaning by inquiring various definitions of education rather than to follow blindly a definition which an authoritative educational scholar provides. (Ibid, p.24)

The text thus introduces several different ways of understanding education by discussing some representative definitions of education in the history of educational thought: Kant's "normative" understanding as "the formation of moral character," Rousseau's "naturalistic" understanding as "unfolding innate human nature," Spranger's "cultural" definition as "socialization into cultural values," and Bum-Mo Jung's "developmental" definition as "bringing intended changes in human behavior" (pp.26-32).

What does it mean to have one's own understanding of education, when the text introduces several different ways of understanding in order to help students' understanding of the meaning of education. If the text really intends to help student teachers to have their own understanding of education, the discussion of education must be an opening of inquiry by probing more deeply into what it really means through an examination of the various ways of understanding. It must not be closing one's perspective by selecting a particular position one prefers among them. But, the text's understanding of education seems not to be this case.

In spite of the text's saying that "we should not follow an authoritative definition blindly," the text seems

to restrict itself in a particular way of understanding education. The most preferred and widely accepted understanding of education in this text as well as in the others is the "developmental" view: "bringing intended changes in human behavior" (Moral Education, p.138; Child Development, p.22; Physical Education, p.240; The Foundations, p.12, 30). One of the texts says:

> Defining education as "bringing intended changes in human behavior" is the most acceptable definition in our situation. Education must contribute to the development of the nation. The important task for education is then to identify human characteristics which are needed in our society, and to strive for the cultivation of the traits. (The Foundations, p.75)

Defining education as "bringing intended changes in human behavior" reflects both the instrumental and technical value systems in education. It has an ends-means rationality that approaches an economic model. In this definition, for example, the term "intended" is connotative of "ends" or "purposes" of education. For what purpose, then, does education exist? Someone might "get" an education for a certain purpose; attaining a job or gaining privilege. Or a society might "give" the people an education for certain societal purposes. In any case, implied by the language "get" or "give," education becomes a "thing" which can be given and taken, and which can be used for a purpose. Education becomes a means to an end that is outside of the nature of education. The meaning of education is determined only in terms of its ends.

When education is conceived in an instrumental way, it can serve any purpose which is perceived as "desirable." The only concern of education is related to the question of how to achieve given ends: a technical concern of method for efficiency. It is reflected in the language of "changing human behavior." With this language, education becomes a field of behavioral technology aimed at controlling human behavior in order to produce certain intended ends.

Why do the texts accept this kind of instrumental and technical understanding of education? What is the situation which makes this behavioral definition of education most acceptable in Korean education? We have already discussed briefly in the previous chapter the situational contexts of the texts. During the 1960's and the 1970's in Korea, "modernization" and "economic development" were the terms that had been most frequently used by politicians as well as educators.

In the education field, the term "modernization" was interpreted in two ways; one way was searching for the role of education in the nation's economic development in terms of providing "manpower," and the other way was an endeavor to make education itself a "science." These two interpretations were well represented by the two slogans which were the most important themes in Korean education during the 1970's. They were: "Education for National Development" and "Beyond the Walls of the Blackboard."

Sociologically, there can be and are different theories and positions as to the role education should play in creating a better society. However, as a curriculum study the concern here is more with the second interpretation; the way in which the term "modernization" is understood within education. A text gives an interpretation of the meaning of "modernization" in this context:

> When the term modernization is used in education, it has a broader meaning than the political or economical concept. It is used in education to refer to the scientification and rationalization of education. Although various expressions are possible to explain the term from different perspectives, the common traits of modernization throughout the field can be characterized by rational thinking and the modern scientific method. In terms of language education, these two characteristics of modernization require systematic theories on language education, scientific organization of the content, and the development of efficient teaching methods. (Language Education, pp.30-31)

In the course of suggesting new directions for the modernization of language education, the text equates the term "modernization" to "scientification." Although the text does not say what the term "scientific" means, the text uses several terms repeatedly such as "effective," "economical," "productive," "systematic," and "accuracy" in discussing the "scientific" way of education. The text strongly implies that scientific efficiency is the only criterion in distinguishing modern education from the more traditional forms.

The ways in which the term modernization is interpreted in Korean education represent in part the ways in which the meaning of teacher competence is understood by the texts. If

education is understood as a means for providing "manpower" for the development of the nation, teacher competence also becomes a kind of "manpower." If education is conceived as a science, a behavioral technology, teacher competence is also to be conceived as a technical matter. Within this perspective, a competent teacher is one who has skills and techniques oriented toward efficient behavioral control. The teacher becomes a training technician who can manipulate student behavior so as to get the students to behave as s/he wants. The texts' understanding of teacher competence becomes clearer when one of the texts says:

> Some people often indicate sincerity, enthusiasm, virtue, or love of child as a trait of the good teacher. But these are common traits which are needed to every person whether or not he or she is a teacher. Admitting that education is bringing intended changes in human behavior, the competent teacher must be a person who knows well how to bring changes in human behavior, and can do it effectively. (The Foundations, p.40)

The texts' understanding of teacher competence is highly mechanistic. Competence in teaching is conceived as a group of behavioral characteristics which are concerned with the particular knowledge and/or skills for use in a given situation. A competent teacher is expected to be able to demonstrate his or her competence as a particular performance in order to produce efficient products. Competence is understood here always as a "doing" of particular things.

The texts' understanding of education and teacher competence as the quest for "providing manpower" and

"behavioral technology" certainly ignores the mode of knowing beyond the reach of the language of technology, and ignores the modes of being which exist outside the realm of technological concepts. That which cannot be expressed into behavioral terms cannot be considered as human competence. It remains in the order of "nonsense" and becomes, therefore, meaningless. In this understanding, human beings are always conceived as the sum of behaviors. Teachers are simply regarded as not much more than "things." Cunningham (1979) quotes Bach and Deutsch:

> When a person is "thinged" only one aspect or group of aspects, of his existence is recognized as real.... People who are "thinged" can also be facilitators. In this case they are like machines, or extensions of machines, that make things available to others. (p.4)

In attempting to understand the meaning of teacher competence through the meaning of education, a question arises here. If education has only instrumental value as a means for certain ends, as the texts understand it, does education have no meaning in itself? More basically, does education always have external purposes? Let me take an example to make clear this question. Imagine how astonished we would be if someone argues that education can teach students stealing. We might respond to the argument by asking back, "How is it possible in education?" or "How can education do that?"

What I am questioning here with this example is not an epistemological question asking, "What human behaviors should be sought in education?" but an ontological asking,

"On what ground is this kind of response possible?" If someone understands education as "changing human behavior," teaching stealing might be for him or her an education. But, in reality, nobody can accept this argument in the name of education. This means that education has its own meaning rather than being a mere means to achieve certain ends defined by an individual or societal needs.

In a concerted effort to search for the meaning of teacher competence through the interpretation of the texts' understanding of education, we find ourselves attempting to uncover what lies beneath the written words of the texts in order to reveal some fundamental dimensions of the meaning. It is the task of disclosing what should be said from what is said in the texts.

As a way of doing so, we need to re-think the etymological origin of the Korean word, "教育(kyo-yuk)." Although the origin of the word does not tell us the way in which the word should be understood, it is a historical comment on the meaning of the word. By the etymological origin of the word, we can go back to primordial meanings which might have been lost from the view of our language tradition.

The etymological origin of "教育" tells us that the word originally included both meanings of "teaching" and "nurturing." But, the texts' understanding of the word is one-sided when they restrict the meaning of school education to one of them:

> As formal education which is characterized by intentional planning for education, school education emphasizes "教(teaching)" rather than "育(nurturing)" which is emphasized in home education. (The Foundations, p.13)

The text also says what formal education is:

> Formal education is conducted at a particular place with a particular purpose, while informal education is done in a larger society. Therefore, the former has a narrower meaning, while the latter has a broader meaning of education. (Ibid, pp.12-3, emphasis mine)

The above two passages give us an important clue in interpreting the text's understanding of education. The text restricts its understanding of education to a "narrower" sense, to the meaning of "teaching" conceived as "changing human behavior," while eliminating the meaning of "nurturing" from education. But, the text does not say why the meaning of "nurturing" cannot be accepted in school education. If the meaning of "nurturing," as the text interprets, is "cultivating good deeds," why does it have to be eliminated from school education? Can we really teach children without nurturing them?

The meaning of "nurturing" seems to be not less important than that of "teaching" to the meaning of education as a whole. Nurturing is an emotionally based state of receptivity to another creature, that evolves from giving special attention to inner realms of meaning often dulled by attention to persons as "things." The etymological origin of the word "education" in Latin also sounds similar to the meaning of "nurturing" when van Manen (1982)

interprets it as:

> The pedagogue is the adult who shows the child the way into a world. My world, and yours. I know something about being a child. Because I have been there, where you are now. I was young once. But childhood is something one must grow out of (*educere*: to lead out of). And so my adulthood becomes an invitation, a beckoning to the child (*educare*: to lead into). This is the meaning of leading: going first. (p.285)

If education is understood, as the texts do, as "teaching without nurturing" and "bringing intended changes in human behavior," it is extremely difficult to distinguish the meaning of education from that of "training" or "conditioning." The understanding also makes it difficult to consider teacher competence with certain unknowable dimensions of human beings. They are to be ignored rather than to be searched for understanding. The meaning of teacher competence is apt to be restricted to a narrow logic of science and technology with a veneer of modernization of education.

Bureaucratic Understanding of Curriculum and Teacher Competence

Defining does not necessarily help understanding, but it is sometimes necessary to attempt to clarify meanings, especially where words are used in quite different ways in different contexts. There is a problem about the meaning of curriculum. We know that there is no consensual understanding of the term curriculum itself in the field. Rather, it is a truism, perhaps, to say that one can find at

least as many definitions of curriculum as one can find curriculum books. The term is defined differently according to one's way of understanding the problems and issues treated in the curriculum field.

From different patterns of understanding of curriculum, distinct curricular knowledge and classroom acts are derived. The ways in which individuals understand the meaning of curriculum are reflected in their use of language, because the type of language used to speak about curriculum is itself a reflection of the way persons think about the field and the meaning it has for them. Language in its deepest sense represents one's social, historical and existential world. Huebner (1975a) comments:

> What is [curriculum] theory? Whatever it is, it seems to be rooted in the language that we use to talk about what we do, and it is the language web that must be our starting point.... It seems to me that one of the tasks of the theorist is to identify the various situations in which we use language, and to find categories that describe the various functions our language serves in those situations. (pp.252-3)

In the texts that are being interpreted here, the term "curriculum" is one of the most frequently used words. It is because the main body of the texts is concerned with curriculum and instruction in elementary school subject areas. One of the foundation texts discusses the meaning of curriculum at a theoretical level. It shows the changes of the meaning of curriculum in the history of Korean education and in the field of curriculum studies in general. The discussion covers the meaning of curriculum as "a course of

study," "students' whole experiences in schools," and "structurally intended learning outcomes." As a summary of the discussion, the text suggests a definition of its own: "Curriculum is the sum of a series of learning tasks a school prepares in order to achieve educational aims and objectives" (Curriculum and Instruction, p.38).

This definition involves the acceptance of an understanding of which the distinctive feature is the view that curriculum takes towards the role of predetermined goals or objectives. We can read this understanding clearly from the following sentences of the text:

> In order to conduct education, at first schools must have clear objectives they intend to bring, and then make various plans for educational activities which are considered to be most effective to bring about those objectives. School education is an intended and organized activity, and the whole plan of this activity is curriculum. We cannot think of school education without curriculum, and of curriculum without its objectives. (Ibid, p.33)

The above passage shows us two points of the text's understanding of curriculum: curriculum as plan and as a means to achieve educational aims or objectives. But, the two conceptions are not basically different from each other. It is not difficult to extend the conception of curriculum as a plan to the distinction between ends and means. Curriculum is reduced to the planning of means to achieve certain ends. The problem of dualism between curriculum and instruction, as we see in the title of the text, arises in this kind of understanding where curriculum is regarded as plan.

If we accept that curriculum is a means to achieve educational aims or objectives, an apparently simple issue is that of who decides the objectives and how. Some people consider this problem as an important issue in curriculum studies in terms of the politics of curriculum (see Lawton, 1980). Popular discussions on this matter often seem to be concerned with the question of either teachers should decide everything about the curriculum, or there must be a centrally-controlled uniform curriculum operating in all schools.

Throughout all the texts interpreted in this study, however, the term curriculum is used strictly to denote "The School Curriculum" which is legislated at the national level by the governmental ministry of education. This does not mean that the politicians or educational administrators have the right to decide on curriculum matters in Korea. "The School Curriculum" has been prepared by a special task committee composed of the representatives of educational experts, subject-matter specialists, educational administrators, and teachers, and then the government legislates the committee's proposal. The government also prepares the elementary school textbooks according to this curriculum, and approves the junior and senior high school textbooks.

The main point of discussion here is with the question of how the teacher education texts understand the meaning of curriculum; it is not the main concern to question the

quality of "The School Curriculum" itself or the politics of curricular decision-making. Rather a more important issue that is central to other issues that are currently under discussion is that the establishment of a unified curriculum and the public accountability of teachers seem to make an instrumental understanding of curriculum inevitable.

The legislated "School Curriculum" defines the guiding principles of Korean education in general, and gives the specific objectives and the contents which are supposed to be taught at each grade from kindergarten to high school with guidelines for curriculum implementation and the time allotment for each subject area. For example, guidelines for curriculum implementation in elementary schools begin with the following sentence:

> Within the framework of this curriculum, instructional planning is done at the school level with due consideration given to the stages of pupils' intellectual and physical development, and the unique needs of each school and its community. (emphasis mine)

What the guideline implies with the above sentence is that what teachers should do at the school level is not curricular consideration -what should be taught and why, but only instructional consideration -how to teach given contents in order to achieve predetermined objectives. The only responsibility for teachers is to develop their teaching skills with reference to the students' developmental conditions and the unique needs of local communities. But the "guidelines" further prescribes even guidelines for teaching and evaluation.

The administrative structure establishes norms governing the organization of educational arrangements. The administrative arrangements of a particular program are in the form of stipulation. These arrangements legitimate the way to go about teacher preparation. These arrangements are sometimes explicit statements of the rules, and the language used in those proposals predefines the ways in which the proposals are to be interpreted.

It was already commented in the previous chapter that the teacher education system in Korea is under the control of the central government, and that the preparation of elementary school teachers is monopolized by the national teachers' colleges founded by the government. The government prepares "The School Curriculum" which defines the objectives and the contents that should be taught in the schools with guidelines for curriculum planning, teaching, and evaluation. The government also gives a framework of elementary teacher education curriculum and brief syllabuses for the courses.

In this situation, it is apt for teacher educators to think that the answers to certain fundamental questions on teacher education are already given and fixed. The questions, such as what teachers should do in the schools, what teacher education should be to prepare teachers, and most importantly what the competent teacher is, are apt to be considered as questions whose answers are already out there objectively and independently from those who are

concerned with teacher education. According to John Eggleston (1977), this is "received perspective" which assumes that:

> there are established and knowable structures of knowledge that exist independently of teachers or indeed any other individuals; that these patterns may be discovered, clarified, and comprehended, and that adherence to them is either necessary or at least highly desirable if curriculum is to be meaningful and learning experiences successful. (p.56)

This perspective is the consequence of not questioning the external intentionalities within a social situation. It is the acceptance of the objectifications and interpretations of others, or of an authority. Under conditions of this perspective, school education is restricted to having its meaning as an institution to serve for certain ends already fixed. Curriculum becomes talk about subject matter as a thing apart, in and of itself, that has to be learned. In the classroom situation, inquiry is already patterned, and the pedagogical relationship among teacher, student and text is organized in terms of what and how the subject matter is presented.

In the teacher education context, if the meaning of curriculum is understood as written documents which contain only "a series of learning tasks," and the documents are handed down to teachers as a form of stipulation, the curriculum itself determines the whole process of teacher education irrespective of the intentions of the teacher educators. This is reflected in the format of the texts which is restricted in the mechanical implementation of "The

School Curriculum."

The main concern of teachers is then related only to how to make lesson plans, how to teach, and how to evaluate learning results. The teacher's role on the matter of curriculum, the texts suggest, is to know well the curriculum which is handed down to him or her, and to try to implement it in the classroom. One of the texts explicitly expresses this view:

> What does it mean to teach well? If a teacher does not know the objectives and the contents to be taught in his class, how can we call him a good teacher? It is very dangerous to teach students according to one's own arbitrary decision in disregard of "The School Curriculum." It is an important task for teachers to study the objectives and the contents described in the curriculum, and to teach students with a plan which is linked directly with the curriculum. (Language Education, p.87)

Nobody can deny the argument that teachers should know the school curriculum with which they are supposed to work. But, the problem that I am now discussing is that there is little room in the texts to allow student teachers to think about the curriculum itself and to have their own understanding of curriculum. This is to say that a teacher education program must be a place where teacher educators and student teachers search for their own answers to various educational questions rather than a place where predetermined meanings are passed down.

Even if we accept the texts' understanding of curriculum as a plan of learning tasks to be taught in the schools, another important aspect still remains in considering the meaning of teacher competence. The

understanding of curriculum as a plan implies the idea that the curriculum must be implemented in concrete classroom situations by teachers. Examining the texts' understanding of curriculum implementation, therefore, is necessary in attempting to understand the meaning of curriculum and teacher competence.

The curriculum texts interpreted in this study seem to understand curriculum implementation as a mechanical procedure consisting of a sequence of four separate segments: curricular objectives, curricular contents, learning experiences, and evaluation of the learning results. The texts term this sequence "a curricular system" (The Foundations, pp.75-100; Curriculum and Instruction, pp.40-43). Although the texts say that this "curricular system" is not linear but a circular process; a process circulating from objectives to content, to experiences, to evaluation, and again to objectives as a means of giving feedback, the idea that curricular procedure must be thought of in terms of objectives and the evaluation of the results is a taken-for-granted assumption throughout all the texts. This is evident in the fact that the texts allot many pages to discussing the necessity of stating objectives specifically and the methods of evaluating learning results. The following sentence tells us more clearly the texts' understanding of the curricular procedure:

> The success of a curricular activity is to be evaluated upon an appropriate assessment of the behavioral changes that the activity appears to have brought about in comparison with the pre-stated

objectives for the activity. (Science Education, p.133)

The texts' understanding of curricular implementation is reflected in a model in which educational objectives and their evaluation are directly connected. The other elements have their value insofar as they serve as instruments to maximize the product intended by objectives; only those end products that can be measured quantitatively by "a scientific and operational method of evaluation" (Curriculum and Instruction, p.280). The texts' understanding seems to minimize or neglect the teacher's creative act of curriculum implementation in the classroom. It seems to trivialize teacher competence into a technical matter of handling the given materials.

For a teacher, however, implementation of curriculum is a creative and situational act rather than rule-governed technical process. Interpretation of a curriculum depends upon the teacher's understanding of children, classroom, the curriculum itself, and so forth. In this sense, Aoki (1984b) sees curriculum implementation as "practical action" by which he means:

> Competence in implementing curriculum X may be seen as a dialectical relationship among teachers, students and curriculum X, mediated by everyday language and oriented towards practical interest in establishing open and non-violent subjectivity on which authentic communication depends. These dialectic interactions are rooted in the network of interpretive meanings given by actors within that situation. (p.114)

Dealing with curriculum in a classroom is the personal and communal venturing for a teacher. Experienced teachers

may know that a documented curriculum cannot be mechanically adopted into the classrooms. They may know that dealing with a curriculum in the classroom is not like an application of a general statement to a particular instance to determine whether the instance fits the statement. What comes first for the classroom teacher is not the written curriculum, but the classroom situation in which are the teacher and students. The situation determines, of course, through dialogue and reflection, what aspects of the curriculum will be selected as relevant and subsequently made use of. As far as the classroom situation is alive, the actual curriculum of the classroom is also alive, moving toward ongoing transformation. How can we speak of curriculum as a fixed document, and curriculum implementation as a process of mechanical adoption?

If we give more consideration to the lived world of the classroom, we may find another aspect of curriculum that the texts cannot consider with their mechanical understanding. To show this aspect of curriculum, let me quote a paragraph from Madeleine Grumet (1978) who analogues curriculum to theater:

> Curriculum is artifice. We must shape it, use it. We must not let it bury us, intimidated by its authority, modeled in its image, confusing its words with the primary silence from which they spring. Theater offers us a way of working that permits us to realize our freedom, showing us how we may fill the empty forms that we receive with our own experience of them and thus transform them and ourselves. (p.44)

When we observe a particular classroom where a teacher and students are enthusiastic for something, are we not able to see a live-drama in there? Are we not able to see the teacher and students who are making their own curriculum based on their own experiences? The teacher transforms the classroom into a place where something happens. It is an event they share on the stage called classroom. In that event, we see their excitement, fantasies, or anxiety. The real curriculum is there as a form of dynamic relationship. Teacher competence is also there as an ability to respond to the situation and to transform them through on-going interpretation of the situation. Pinar (1975b) tries to restore the original meaning of curriculum when he writes:

> I propose yet another meaning of the word, one stemming from its Latin root, *currere*. The distinction is this: current usages of the term appear to me to focus on the observable, the external, the public. The study of *currere*, as the Latin infinitive suggests, involves the investigation of the nature of individual experience of the public: of artifacts, actors, operations, of the educational journey of pilgrimage. (p.400)

Technical Conceptualization of Teaching and Teacher Competence

There can be education without educational administration or a school building, but not without pedagogical relationship among teacher, student and text in a reciprocal face-to-face situation. This pedagogical relationship is usually termed teaching and learning. Therefore, the ways in which the meanings of teaching and

learning are understood define the meaning of pedagogical relationship, and, in turn, provide criteria for thinking of teacher and student in a pedagogical situation. What kind of language and what criteria are then used in the teacher education curriculum texts to describe teaching and learning?

A text quotes an epigram from Hsun-tzu, a philosopher of ancient China:

> Although indigo comes from blue, indigo is deeper in colour than blue. Although ice is made of water, ice is colder than water. (Physical Education, p.113)

The text uses this quotation to connote a meaning of teaching, and interprets it like this:

> What is teaching? The facts that indigo comes from blue, and ice is made of water are commonsense notions nobody can doubt. But, teaching is a profound phenomenon in which each of blue and water become each of indigo and ice. (Ibid.)

Although the text's interpretation is not enough to grasp the whole meaning of teaching, one of the points the interpretation tries to make is that teaching is a profound work which can make something beyond the given. When a sculptor has chiseled a statue out of stone, we no more see the statue as stone. The text seems to say that teaching is an art like sculpturing.

When teaching is understood from the point of view of art or aesthetics, various uses of human intellect are possible. The intent throughout teaching becomes not a search for preconceived ends but a search for beauty, for a harmonious classroom. With aesthetic understanding,

classroom teaching "unfolds in a rhythmic series of events, which symbolizes the meaning of man's temporal existence" (Huebner, 1975b, p.233).

The aesthetic aspect of the Hsun-tzu's epigram, however, has been distorted by the next paragraph on the same page of the text arguing that "we need professional techniques of teaching especially in physical and art education." With this sentence, the text seems to equate the techniques of teaching with profound work of art. Is doing art a technical matter? If a sculptor follows a pre-formulated rule of techniques for his or her work, can we call him or her an artist? What is the difference between the work of artist and that of a skillful factory-worker?

We can see the texts' understanding of teaching more clearly with another text which discusses teaching at a theoretical level. The text defines teaching as "an intentional process of creating and controlling the learning conditions in order to bring desirable changes in the learner's behavior" (Curriculum and Instruction, p.141). The text uses the term "teaching-learning process" to talk about the matter of teaching because it sees the pedagogical relationship as an interactional activity of teaching and learning. It makes clear what the relationship between teaching and learning is:

> Learning is the end, and teaching is a means. Any teaching activity cannot have value in itself; the value must be judged in relation to the student's learning outcomes which it has brought about. Any teacher, teaching material or teaching method can be considered as valuable in that it brings successful

> learning to the student. Teaching is not the sufficient condition but a necessary condition for learning. The relationship between teaching and learning is that of means and ends. (Curriculum and Instruction, p.142)

If we accept the text's argument that good teaching is a means to bring successful learning, another question is necessary: What is successful learning? One of the texts allots more than sixty pages to discuss the matter of learning, and the pages are filled with various psychological learning theories and a description of the learning process. Nowhere does it give an answer to the question of what successful or good learning is. Rather, it defines learning as "the acquisition of all new patterns of response, desirable or undesirable, that is, any changes in learner's behavior" (Child Development, p.185, emphasis mine).

But, the other texts have a clear answer to the question: What is good teaching? The only valid criterion for judging good teaching, according to the texts, is "the degree to which the educational objectives are being achieved in the student's learning outcomes" (Language Education, p.274). The texts argue that the most important principle of teaching is that of consistency with predetermined objectives, because "teaching and learning which have no relation to the objectives are wasteful efforts, and furthermore have the danger of misguiding education" (Social Studies, p.116). Basically, "The School Curriculum" gives a guideline for teaching in elementary

schools as follow:

> Various teaching methods and materials may be utilized in order to enrich teaching. In this case, the methods and materials should be consistent with the objectives and content of the primary school curriculum and also with the pupils' learning levels. (p.15)

It seems that the dominant understanding of the texts on teaching is concerned only with the feasibility of accomplishing educational objectives by means of students' learning outcomes. A crucial feature of the texts' understanding of teaching is to be found in the technical conceptualization of teaching, regarding it as "controlling the learning conditions." To view teaching as "controlling the conditions for learning" is a psychological theory of a behaviorist kind rather than that of educators. For its justification lies in what it leads to, teaching becomes an instrument for the ends or purposes outside itself, and the act of teaching becomes objectified into law-like behaviors. This view of teaching requires us to accept that the teaching act can be explored and analyzed in the same way as the behavior of inanimate objects, that it can be studied scientifically in terms of causes rather than purposes, by reference to external force acting on the individual rather than internal drives and choices of a personal kind.

Scientific theories too frequently assume that they are all of a piece, and hide the fact that they neglect some parts of a phenomenon that cannot be explained by their logic. One aspect of teaching, probably more important than the other, is rejected by the term scientific or

psychological, when a text says:

> In considering successful learning, there are two aspects. The one is concerned with the question of what kind of knowledge and skills are valuable to be learned in a society. This aspect requires a value judgment, and thus is out of the psychological consideration. The other aspect is a methodological question: how the maximum of children can be guided to the maximum level of learning.... Teaching theory is normative because it is suggestive of the principles and laws which can guide us to the best way of learning. To maximize the learning effects, the functional relations of teaching and learning must be clarified and systemized. (excerpted from Curriculum and Instruction, pp.144-6)

The use of the language of "the functional relations of teaching and learning" comes from an understanding that teaching should be consonant with the learning theories as established by psychology, and the results of learning could be used to evaluate the efficiency of a particular teaching. In this understanding, teaching and learning are usually divided into separate variables which are assumed to compose the "teaching-learning process," and teachers are supposed to know the causal relations between these variables in order to control them for the learners to reach goals with reference to the principles that psychological investigations have provided. For example, one of the texts lists eleven general principles of teaching as follows:

1. Clear awareness of the objectives
2. Learning tasks suitable for the learners
3. Sequential organization of the learning tasks
4. Positive attitude of the teacher to learners
5. Intrinsic motivation
6. Consideration of individual differences
7. Direct experiences of learners
8. Democratic environment
9. Positive reinforcement
10. Pertinent teaching materials

11. Immediate feedback (Curriculum and Instruction, pp.167-174)

The psychological view of teaching is dominant throughout the principles. They equate teaching with the method of learning by focusing on the learner's performance rather than the teacher's. Systematic teaching and hierarchical learning are preferred because the sequencing of content and the selection of a teaching method are believed to be worked out within the lines of predetermined objectives. With these principles, the relationship between teaching and learning becomes a linear "process" between ends and means, but not a reciprocal relationship of teacher and students.

On the basis of these observations and considerations, we may venture an interpretation of the texts' understanding of teaching and teacher competence. The meaning of teaching understood by the texts is that teaching is an instrumental behavior of the teacher which is designed to bring about changes in the behavior of the students, due to learning outcomes. Teaching and learning are seen by the texts as two different categories in a pedagogical situation. The relationship between the two categories is considered to be functional, and the two are seen to work together in order to meet the predefined expectations of adequate performance. Of course, much attention is paid in the texts to the importance of teaching, but ultimately, the main concern is with the learning results on the part of student, while the teacher's work is often seen as a mere, although important,

means of achieving designed results.

The teacher is seen as interacting with the students in ways which correspond to the psychological principles of learning. The teacher's work becomes a matter of stating explicitly what the students are expected to do, of arranging the stimuli to which the students are supposed to respond, of channelling student responses in well-defined ways by means of learning theories, of evaluating student responses objectively, etc., in other words, of arranging the situation which will expedite learning.

In this respect, we may regard the texts' understanding of teaching as technical valuing and instrumental rationality. This may be a part of the meaning of teaching. But, if one reduces all teaching to only this meaning, the mysteriously complex phenomenon of teaching will be misguided. A more serious problem is the fact that viewing the teacher as an instrument to bring pre-set production, by reducing teacher competence to a "thing," a technical matter, voids the teacher's individual wishes or desires, that is, his or her own subjectivity.

The texts usually assume that the scientific way of teaching is the only way teachers have to follow. The texts seem to regard science and technology as an objective method of teaching which can be used in any kind of class. But, if we drive our thinking a step further, we soon realize that science and technology do not mean simply a way of doing something. As Heidegger (1977, p.13) sees, they are

essentially "a mode of revealing," a way of seeing and being in the world. Don Ihde (1979) gives a good interpretation of Heidegger:

> Technology-science is from the beginning a form of action which asserts and denies various possible values. Nor is technology possible as a pure neutrality; it is a "choice" of a possible way of being in the world. thus ultimately, science is not a form of contemplation of the external forms, but is the arrangement of human social, political and individual action with the world. (p.xxvi)

It is thus meaningless to think of the term "scientific" as a mere method of teaching which can be used for any kind of education we intend. Once we adopt scientific logic into our teaching, the logic enters into every nook and corner of education, and changes goals and values of education to the point of the very meaning of human existence. Science and technology inevitably restrict and degrade the meaning of teacher competence into their own narrow logic. Since they are a "choice," science and technology neglect the aspect of teacher competence which is not included in their choice.

Teaching skills, for example, are important for teachers. But, the idea that the skills of teaching are to be treated as discrete behaviors such as stating objectives or arranging the stimuli and reinforcement reflects a fundamental misconception of technological logic as to what it means to be skilled in teaching. Rather, what skilled teaching requires is the ability to recognize dynamic patterns of classroom situation, to grasp their meaning, and the ingenuity to invent ways to respond to the changes in

the situation. It requires the ability to both lose oneself in the act of teaching and at the same time maintain a subsidiary awareness of what one is doing. Teaching skills are rather a matter of "practical reason" than that of "technical reason" as Terrance Carson (1983) reveals from a conversation with teachers:

> Rationalization [of teaching] necessarily reduces the full meaning of teaching as a practical activity.... Practical reason, unlike technical reason, does not entail the application, in advance, of solutions to anticipated problems like this. It is by nature situational, where one sees within the situation an occasion demanding the exercise of practical, ethical decision-making. (pp.39-40)

We may know from our own experiences as students or teachers that there are certain areas which do not lend themselves to the technical approach to teaching and understanding of teacher competence as instrumental and technical reason. We may know from the memories of our old teachers that good teaching is not a matter of unreflective adoption of psychological principles of teaching, but a teacher's way of being in the classroom. Talking about teacher competence, therefore, is not a question of what teachers do in the classroom, but of who they are; how they express themselves as a whole in the classroom.

At this point, we must reconsider the teaching of Hsun-tzu's epigram, the aesthetic value of teaching. Genuine artists do not aim at end-product or the quantity of product. An imaginative leap is always required in doing art. The artists try to express the whole of their experiences and transform them into their works of art. Art

theory can help them, but only as a guide not a prescription. They create their own skills rather than simply follow prescribed rules. This is why we give higher value on the works of art than factory-manufactured goods. Is teaching much different from doing an art? Eisner (1983) tries to disclose hidden meanings of teaching by drawing an analogy between teaching and conducting an orchestra:

> What we do as teachers is to orchestrate the dialogue moving from one side of the room to the other. We need to give the piccolos a chance -indeed to encourage them to sing more confidently- but we also need to provide space for the brass. And as for the violins, they always seem to have a major part to play. How is it going? What does the melody sound like? Is the music full enough? Do we need to stretch the orchestra further? When shall we pause and recapitulate the introductory theme? The clock is reaching ten and we have not yet crescendoed? How can we bring it to closure when we can't predict when a stunning question or an astute observation will bring forth a new melodic line and off we go again? Such are the pleasures and trials of teaching and when it goes well, there is nothing more that we would rather do. (pp.10-11)

Objectification of Human Knowing and Teacher Competence

A fundamental fact about human being is his or her ability to know, to be aware of things, of him or herself, and even of his or her own awareness. We could not even begin to discuss the question of education or teacher if we are not aware of what it means to know. With this ability of human knowing and human knowledge which is essentially symbolic thought, human beings can live with other beings by sharing their knowledge. Considering that teachers are persons who introduce children into the world of knowledge

and knowing, it seems natural to expect that we can reveal a part of the meaning of teacher competence from the texts' understanding made about the nature of knowledge and human knowing.

Then, how do the curriculum texts understand the nature of knowledge and human knowing? The explicit and implicit understanding of the texts as to the nature of knowledge can be featured in the following three predispositions:

1. Knowledge is meant for use.
2. Knowledge must be objective.
3. Knowledge has a hierarchical order.

The first feature is revealed from the texts' discussion of selecting educational contents. Since schools must select and organize knowledge so as it to be pertinent to each level of education as a part of educational content, some criteria are necessary to select "important, effective and high-valued knowledge" (The Foundations, p.89). For this, two of the texts give seven principles for selecting educational content by expanding Tyler's (1949) five principles. They are:

1. Consistency with the objectives
2. The novelty and reliability of knowledge
3. The utility and transferability of knowledge
4. Knowledge as intellectual process and attitude
5. Balance between basic knowledge and practical knowledge
6. Usefulness in attaining several objectives at the same time
7. The validity to the ability and interest of student (The Foundations, pp.88-93; Curriculum and Instruction, pp.108-112)

One clear point in the above principles is that knowledge has value as a means to attain something, whatever it is. The value of knowledge is determined by its utility. Knowledge as means can have higher value if it is useful to do a maximum number of things with a minimum amount of it, that is, according to the law of efficiency. Some texts use Bruner's conception of "structure of knowledge" in this context by arguing that the basic concepts and principles in a subject area are more valuable in education than concrete individual knowledge because they have broader applicability in spite of rapid social changes.

Once knowledge is justified by the argument of utility, it makes no difference whatever the knowledge acquired is used for, solving social problems, gaining jobs, attaining privileges, or any other end. It makes no difference because knowledge which is guided by this epistemological principle crystallizes in the end into a single behavior. At no stage do we see human knowing as an expression of human living itself, but always as a means to do something else. Thus all knowledge comes to be regarded only as of utilitarian value.

When knowledge is conceived to have only utilitarian value, the characteristic of teaching is supposed to have an emphasis on the concept of training which gives birth to techniques of teaching, and the status of knowledge becomes that of "commodities" to be sold to the students at school. Knowledge is always seen as a "product" rather than as a "process" of human knowing. This idea carries a hidden

concept of student as a repository to be filled up with product-knowledge, and of teacher as a knowledge salesman.

The instrumental interest of knowledge produces a profound sense of alienation in the classroom situation by destroying the authentic relations between teacher and students for the purpose of maximization of means to achieve an end. In this view of human knowing and knowledge, teacher and student are deprived of their meaning-making potentials in their own experiences of knowing.

The second feature of the texts' understanding, that knowledge must be objective, is revealed from the texts' understanding that educational knowledge is obtained from out there objectively, but not made from the commnicative understanding between teacher and students in educational situations, from the expressions, actions, and experiences of the teacher and students. One of the texts says:

> Although children can learn certain social abilities or attitudes from their personal situations, social problems have a more objective character, and are not a matter of subjective experiences. In order to understand social problems more synthetically, therefore, objective knowledge is more helpful than subjective experiences. (Social Studies, p.35)

The "principles of selecting educational content" listed before uses the terms "novelty" and "reliability" instead of "objectivity." How can novelty and reliability of knowledge be certified? Who has the right to certify it? One of the texts recommends to teachers:

> With the development of modern scientific technology and the rapid increase in the amount of knowledge, yesterday's "new knowledge" has become "old knowledge" today. In order to keep educational

> content novel and reliable, teachers must seek advice from the subject specialists who represent each subject area when they select and organize educational content. (The Foundations, p.89)

The above passage implies an assumption that the subject specialists in each area are the only persons who can make "new knowledge," and who can guarantee the reliability of knowledge. The communication of knowledge is assumed to be linear in nature flowing from specialists, through teachers, to students. The personal knowledge that teachers or students make from their individual experiences in educational settings is not regarded as reliable knowledge if it is not useful to back up the official knowledge legitimized by the specialists. Knowledge based on personal experiences is considered as a mere "opinion" or "feeling," and thus it is believed that this kind of personal feeling must be eliminated from educational settings in order to make education a science. In a text, we read:

> The study of language education is a field in the social sciences. The practice of language teaching must be based on the scientific theories that studies on language and pedagogy have developed. But, it is a regretful fact that there are still a few teachers who teach language according to their own private experiences in defiance of scientific principles on language teaching. The scientification of language education is possible only when teachers break out from their conventional force of habit. (Language Education, p.72)

Several fundamental questions arise from the texts' understanding of knowledge and human knowing: What is objective knowledge? What is the criterion of being objective? If personal experience is not objective

knowledge, how is human understanding possible? What is the difference between "feeling" and "knowing"? Is human knowing possible without feeling?

We have already discussed Gadamer's notion that human understanding cannot be free from one's pre-judgment since every understanding always starts with one's own existentially defined situation. We have also heard Heidegger's saying as to the presuppositionlessness of human knowing. Although the scientific mind pretends that there is only a certain acceptable method for human knowing, we know from our experiences that there are an infinite variety of ways of knowing our world. There are multiple ways of understanding ourselves.

Michael Polanyi, in his well-known book Personal Knowledge (1958), identifies an important aspect of human knowing that has been disregarded by scientists: tacit knowing that is an "ineffable" domain of human knowing based on reflections and intuitions. In one of his other essays, he (1968) describes tacit knowing as:

> Tacit knowing appears to be a doing of our own, lacking the public, objective character of explicit knowledge.... tacit knowledge is in fact the dominant principle of all knowledge, and its rejection would, therefore, automatically, involve the rejection of any knowledge whatever. (p.24)

Polanyi tries to reaffirm the personal and immediate involvement of the individual in the act of knowing. Based on the findings of Gestalt psychology, he tries to show that the personal participation of the knower in the act of knowing does not make our understanding subjective.

According to him, genuine knowing is neither an arbitrary act nor a passive experience, but a responsible act establishing contact with a hidden reality. He describes this fusion of the personal and the objective as "Personal Knowledge." Polanyi's approach sets the stage for widening our perspective about what human knowing really means.

In this sense, the texts' understanding of human knowing seems to miss an important point: the ground of objective knowledge. The nature of knowledge which is taken for granted in the texts' understanding is to be seen as absolute, as being out there independent of the knowing mind. The texts believe that if knowledge is more abstract, it can have wider applicability. This applicability of knowledge is believed to be achieved by detaching the knowledge of a phenomenon from the concrete human knower and the situation in which it is known. The mistake of the absolutist knowledge is in seeing this detaching of knowledge from the situation as becoming objective. It fails to see that real objectivity of knowledge is in the phenomenon itself from which knowledge comes. This is why teachers often voice the lack of applicability of scientific theories on education.

If one thinks that being objective is only possible by detaching knowledge from one's subjectivity, we can realize here that being objective is not synonymous with being correct. One can be objective but wrong, just as one can be true but subjective. Being objective is not a matter of

gaining sophisticated techniques for gathering data and testing evidence. Rather, it is concerned with taking steps to clarify one's prejudice that is embedded in the judgments one makes and precedes his or her understanding. Being objective is to open to one's self-criticism the basis upon which one's judgments are made -so that counter evidence and contrary arguments might, if they exist, be levelled against what one says.

Another conception of knowledge understood by the texts is raised by the clear distinction of the cognitive from the affective and psychomotor dimensions of human experiences of knowing. The conception also set out that all knowledge has a sequential and hierarchical order. To demonstrate the hierarchical character of knowledge, some texts use Bloom's taxonomy, and some use Gagné's "hierarchies of learning." The other texts that do not quote Bloom or Gagné use their own frames to discuss the two-dimensional analysis of educational objectives.

One of the foundation texts provides the basic framework for the distinction of knowledge by dividing its part of "Child Development and Growth," like any other text on human development, into four chapters: developmental theories, physical development, cognitive development, and affective development. It classifies perception, language, memory, thinking, creativity and intelligence into the cognitive domain, and emotion, socialization, morality, attitude, value-orientation and personality into the

affective domain (Child Development, pp.58-182).

A psychological assumption that all human behaviors can be categorized into tripartite aspects is generalized into the area of human knowing. The division of educational objectives into three domains that is a major feature of Bloom's taxonomy is an attempt to create distinctions in human knowledge and the process of human knowing. In this distinction, knowing and believing are different human activities, and thinking and doing have different criteria to be considered.

One of the curriculum texts, for example, discusses the method of moral education in schools by dividing it into moral knowledge, moral attitudes, and moral behavior (Moral Education, pp.52-58), and argues that "moral knowledge is internalized into the mind of children by following five steps Bloom suggests in his taxonomy of affective domain: receiving, responding, valuing, organization, and characterization" (Ibid, pp.122-3). Another text recommends student teachers to "classify educational objectives into the categories of knowledge, intellectual skills, and affective objectives" (Social Studies, p.35).

In many cases, the term "knowledge" is used to denote mere memory level of intellectual activity. It is common in all the texts to distinguish knowledge from higher intellectual skills. The conception of knowledge means information held in memory rather than manipulated as the basis for all other levels of thinking. They seem to take

for granted the assumption that the higher order cognitive functioning is more desirable than knowledge as information, and that the acquisition of more complex skills depends on previous mastery of simple ones.

The linear model that is characteristic of taxonomies such as Bloom's attempts to break down all knowledge into parts, and all human knowing into a step by step procedure. But, we are still not clear as to whether children learn knowledge and then, at some later stage, attain understanding, or they learn the two hand in hand at the same time. We are also not clear as to whether it is possible to envisage an activity that concerns itself only with certain cognitive or intellectual goals without simultaneously involving affective or psycho-motor considerations. It must be emphasized that education should be concerned not only with developing cognitive abilities but at the same time also with promoting a recognition of the intrinsic value of human knowing and a feeling for those standards of truth and beauty which are an essential component of what it means to know and to be educated.

Heidegger (1962) distinguishes between two senses of human knowing: knowing and understanding. This distinction is a critique of the conventional distinction between thinking and feeling, or between cognitive and affective domains of thought. According to him, feeling and knowing go hand in hand in the learning process. Therefore, understanding as a deeper dimension of human knowing becomes

the power to grasp one's own possibilities for being within the context of the lifeworld in which one exists.

A pedagogical situation is a place where teacher and students experience their possibilities for being. It is not a laboratory situation, but a lived world where teacher and students are continuously interpreting the events they experience, and these interpretations shape their stock of knowledge at hand. Experienced competent teachers know immediately how well they are performing their teaching from the eyes of students even before the results of an official test. They know how their eye-contact with students will influence students' learning even before the pronouncement of a scientific theory of reinforcement. This kind of "practical knowledge," which is, in nature, reflective experience of one's doing in concrete situations, may sometimes be more helpful for teachers in teaching children than scientifically verified knowledge. If student teachers are taught to believe that the only reliable and teachable knowledge is objective scientific knowledge, the prospective teachers might be prejudiced towards a sterile form of relativism with regard to scientific knowledge.

In brief review, the texts' understanding of human knowing is reflected in three features that (1) knowledge has validity by its utility, (2) valuable knowledge is of a structural and theoretical nature rather than of individual experiences, and (3) knowledge can be divided into separate parts, and the parts have hierarchical order. These points

have brought significant reflections in the light of teaching and teacher competence. If the texts believe that human knowledge is and must be objective, out there to be learned and mastered as a finished product, the concern of teacher competence becomes a trivializing effort of clarifying the methodologies and models of delivering knowledge. Steeped in the language and assumptions of the empirical-analytic way of human knowing, students in the teacher education program are supposed to learn predefined knowledge and styles of thought, rather than to understand the world from their point of view, as an act of knowing itself, as persons claiming originality and exercising their personal judgments.

The scientific disciplines -the empirical knowledge structure- can be offered as possibilities to individual student teachers, each with the capacity to generate knowledge that relates to his or her concerns, that clarify what s/he wants to say. But, authentic knowledge for teachers is in their way of knowing itself, in their mode of sense-making, in their living with children, in their very mode of being in the world. They are the very source of their knowledge as Merleau-Ponty (1962) says:

> All my knowledge of the world, even my scientific knowledge, is gained from my own particular point of view, or from some experience of the world without which the symbols of science would be meaningless. The whole universe of science is built upon the world as directly experienced, and if we want to subject science itself to rigorous scrutiny and arrive at a precise assessment of its meaning and scope, we must begin by reawakening the basic experiences of the world of which science is the

second-order expression. (p.viii)

D. Initial Reflection: Revealing Underlying Preconceptions

Underlying Preconceptions

In this chapter, I have ventured to interpret a series of Korean teacher education curriculum texts as a way of examining Korean teacher education and of coming to a deeper understanding of the meaning of teacher competence. The venture has been pursued through an interpretive dialogue between the texts and the interpreter which has aimed at disclosing the meaning concealed in the texts. Although the texts do not say anything directly as to the meaning of teacher competence, we have tried to figure it out from the texts' understanding of the four basic concepts in teacher education: education, curriculum, teaching, and human learning.

The texts' understanding of teacher competence, as we have seen through the interpretation, is not far removed from the dominant understanding discussed in chapter II. Or, at least, the texts seem to be on the way toward the dominant understanding, that is, scientific-technological understanding. It is strongly reflected in the texts' efforts to make education a science and the work of teaching a technical professionalism.

We have already discussed in chapter II some problems and limitations of the scientific-technological

understanding of teacher competence as a way of problematizing the dominant paradigm in the contemporary field of teacher education. Some of those problems could also be found in the texts' understanding of teacher competence. We could read from the texts the predominant concern of teacher education as an instrumental preoccupation with the ends-means criterion of technical control. We could also see that prospective teachers are urged to be much more conscious of the technical way of teaching which is considered to bring efficient results. The texts seem to believe that the only way to modernize education is to introduce scientific rationality and technological methods into education. In other words, the texts seem to confuse scientification and technocratization with modernization of education.

Recognizing that integral to a hermeneutical investigation is a questioning of the preconceptions and prejudicies inherent in a preunderstanding, this is the time we must question the underlying preoccupations within which the texts' understanding of teacher competence is embedded. On what ground is this kind of understanding possible? What are hidden rationalities inherent in the texts' understanding of teacher competence?

The scientific-technological rationality with which the texts' understanding of teacher competence is bound is not just a matter of hardware or physical system; it, as we saw through the interpretation of the texts, refers to an unique

configuration of our thoughts and acts. It refers to a choice of a particular way of living in the world that reflects the way in which reality is constituted and known. It is more basically a matter of human "consciousness" in the sense that Berger, et al. (1973) use the term:

> The consciousness of everyday life is the web of meanings that allow the individual to navigate his way through the ordinary events and meanings, which he shares with others, makes up a particular social life-world. (p.12)

The scientific-technological rationality, at its most basic level, is rooted in the foundation of a positivistic epistemology and behavioral psychology. Both theories are forms of inquiry on human knowing in which the social sciences are seen as best modeled after the natural sciences. The emphases are on increased logical and methodological rigor, on greater mathematical sophistication in experimental or correlational control.

The contemporary form of positivism, which stems from the earlier positivism of Auguste Comte, provides a logic of human knowing with a strong respect for that of the natural sciences: empirically grounded, universally binding, and value-free. It served to bring together elements of two powerful bases for human knowing; a synthesis of the logical atomism of Bertrand Russell and early Wittgenstein that based knowledge on self-evidently clear and logical arguments, and the empiricist epistemology of Ernst Mach that based knowledge on sensory or observational experiences (Thompson, 1981, pp.11-2).

Human knowing, for the positivists, is conceived as a kind of scientific explanation. Since social affairs contain law-like regularities which can be identified and manipulated as can objects in the physical world, the positivists argue, the explanation of a social phenomenon is possible by logically reducing the particular event from a universal theory or law along with a value-free statement of initial conditions. This is the so-called "deductive-nomological model of explanation" (Bredo & Feinberg, 1982, p.15).

The positivists argue that scientific theory must seek to describe things as they are, not as they are seen or judged to be. The investigation of social phenomena is thus believed to be independent of the goals and values which people may express within a situation. Consequently, the positivists want to eliminate metaphysical statements from the domain of human studies in order to develop clear criteria for scientific explanation. By limiting valid knowledge to that of analytic or synthetic truth, the main concern of contemporary positivism is to develop a "rigorous science" which makes the study of social phenomena "objective" through the elimination of any reference to subjective factors, human intentions, goals, values, and meanings.

Behavioral psychology is also a positivist theory of human learning based on the control of human behaviors. From the behaviorist perspective, it is assumed that human

behavior is totally determined by its environment, and thus consists of responses of organisms in a stimulus situation. Although more complex, a human being is considered not essentially different from any other animal who responds instinctively to the stimuli of his or her surrounding environment.

Therefore, the behaviorists contend that human behavior can best be explained through an analysis of the relation between the behavior and its situation, and also be predicted and controlled by a manipulation of their variables. In order to carry out more effective control of human behavior, the behaviorists argue, the observer of human behavior must specify objectively what features of a particular occasion are linked with what characteristics of the human behavior in terms of observable and measurable events.

Behavioral psychologists' allegiance of this methodological "objectivism" to the "scientific truth" gives sanction to the prevailing notion of "controlling human behavior" using such terms as "conditioning," "reinforcement," or "behavioral modification." The massive work of human understanding is reduced for the behaviorists to the techniques of human behavioral control. In this manner, behavioral psychology reduces all human behaviors to the facts of overt behavior, understood as the product of stimulus-response relations.

Searching for a Deeper Understanding

> A few years ago the Philadelphia Welfare Department denied a mother custody of her baby on grounds of incompetence. It was an unusual case: The father was absent and the mother was a lifelong quadriplegic whose shrunken limbs were virtually useless. The Welfare Department asserted she was unable to care for her daughter, then five months old, even with daytime household help. But the mother went to court to prove her competence. As spectators stood in awe, she changed the child's diaper before the judge, using her lips and tongue. She also demonstrated that she could type fifty words per minute and play the organ -both by using her tongue. The judge awarded her full custody of her daughter, commended her courage, and commented, "You have proven that the physical endowments we have are only a part of the spectrum of resources that human beings possess. (New York Times, cited in Grant, 1979, p.1)

To view the ideal teacher as an efficient producer of student learning is not revolutionary. What is surprising, at least in the texts' understanding of teacher competence, is its strong preference of the scientific-technological rationality, as if there is no other way in educating teachers.

In the texts' understanding of teacher competence, we saw the pervading evidences of its alliance with positivist epistemology and behavioral psychology. We saw in the texts that they significantly reduce our educational thinking, doing and being into only behavioral terminology by focusing on particular considerations and conditions in order to accomplish given intents in teacher education.

From a perspective of hermeneutics, however, our interest in interpreting the curriculum texts has been concerned not only with grasping the point of what is said

in the texts, but also in revealing the realm of what is unsaid. Rather than merely criticizing a particular view of teacher competence, our endeavor has also been concerned with making visible and understandable a deeper meaning of teacher competence.

Through the interpretation of the texts, we set out together to recover a deeper meaning of teacher competence by bringing to the surface what the texts have lost under the shadow of scientific-technological understanding. Contrary to the dominant view of teacher competence, there have emerged, as a result of our endeavor, some senses which allow us to understand the meaning of teacher competence at a deeper ground. Let me reflect on our understandings in this study as a whole in the next chapter.

Chapter VI

REFLECTING ON THE MEANING OF TEACHER COMPETENCE

A. At the Reflective Moment of the Study

It has been a major theme of this study to inquire into the meaning of teacher competence. A basic assumption of the study has been that any effort aimed at improving teacher education is inevitably geared to the question of what the good or competent teacher is. It is thus believed that the ways in which the meaning of teacher competence is understood in a teacher education program tell us what kind of teacher education it is, and what kind of teachers we can expect from it. Therefore, it has been assumed that if we really want to develop a better form of teacher education, we must start with an endeavour to understand what the term teacher competence really means.

Up to this point, we have had a journey to meet this interest by exploring the dominant mode of understanding of teacher competence in contemporary research and practice of teacher education, and by interpreting a series of Korean teacher education curriculum texts. Through an interpretation of the curriculum texts, we have ventured together to reveal the fundamental dimensions in understanding teacher competence by uncovering some of the hidden aspects of the written words of the texts. Now, we have come to a reflective moment in our long journey of inquiry into the meaning of teacher competence.

It might be helpful to remind ourselves at this point of Gadamer's discussion as to the function of hermeneutical reflection in our understanding. Hermeneutical reflection is conceived as a way of broadening and deepening our understanding in a constant stream of self-reflection. Our deeper understanding is possible through this hermeneutical reflection by a way of renewing our preunderstandings. For this, hermeneutical reflection, as discussed in chapter III, requires a critical awareness of the presuppositions which are concealed in our usually taken-for-granted thinking and acting. By "bringing before me something that otherwise happens behind my back" (Gadamer, 1976, p.38), a hermeneutical reflection enables us to be aware of what is problematic in our preunderstandings.

Therefore, reflection, in a hermeneutical sense, is neither an act of summarizing what has been said before, nor of seeking for final answers or solutions to given questions. It means neither accepting nor rejecting a particular perspective, nor suggesting new findings. Rather, it means re-appreciating our understanding from a deeper ground, trying to become aware of what is questionable. It is a recollective moment for further understanding, a moment that is an opening to a new dimension of questioning.

To reflect upon our understanding of teacher competence, I will bring again the scientific-technological understanding into an extended criticism in order to be aware of the fundamental problems inherent in that mode of

understanding. This awareness is then expected to help us in reflecting upon our new understandings of this study, and as a consequence, to open new dimensions in our inquiry into the meaning of teacher competence. Some reflections upon the personal experience of understanding in this study will follow in the next part. Through this reflective moment of the study, we hope we can break out of the shell surrounding us, and see the world of teachers with a broader and deeper understanding.

As the final chapter, this is the concluding part of the study. But, this chapter does not intend to conclude the study. Human understanding is an infinite process of inquiry into meaning. Understanding the meaning of teacher competence, too, is a never-ending task for teacher educators as far as teachers exist. How can I conclude the understanding of teacher competence?

B. What We Have Lost in Technological Understanding

As the interpretation of the curriculum texts reveals, Korean teacher education seems to be bound with the dominant objectivist tradition in understanding teacher competence. An initial criticism of this dominant mode of understanding was already present in the discussion of CBTE in chapter II, and in the actual interpretation of the curriculum texts in chapter V as an unified process of understanding.

The initial reflection conducted in the previous chapter has revealed that the texts' understanding of

teacher competence is based on technological rationality which is rooted in positivistic epistemology and behavioral psychology, forcing us to think of teacher education in an instrumental and technical way. It is the moment when we have to drive our criticism into a more fundamental ground in order to make our deeper understanding possible.

In an endeavor to come to a deeper understanding of teacher competence, our deepest concern is really an ontological one, i.e., it is a question about human experiences within technological understanding. We already discussed that science-technology is essentially "a mode of revealing," and thus it is "a choice of a possible way of being in the world." Technological understanding of teacher competence, too, is a way of understanding, not the whole way of human thinking and acting. It is one choice of a way of human experience.

But, once we are enslaved to a particular rationality, namely technological rationality in the case of the curriculum texts, it immediately amplifies certain aspects of our experiences while reducing other aspects at the same time. Surely both aspects that are amplified and reduced by technological rationality are parts of human life. For those who want to come to a deeper understanding of human experience, therefore, it is important to be fully aware of this ambivalent character of human understanding.

Throughout our efforts to interpret the curriculum texts in the previous chapter, we have attempted to reveal a

part of the meaning of teacher competence which is reduced and thus unsaid by the texts. It has been an endeavor to fill out the meaning of teacher competence toward the whole. We have tried to recover the lost part of the meaning of teacher competence by referring to our experiences in education, to the etymological origins of some words, or to alternative understandings which tell us that technological understanding is not the whole.

We have understood through the interpretation, for example, that the texts miss the meaning of "nurturing" in their understanding of education, the original meaning of *currere* in curriculum, aesthetic meaning of teaching, and the subjective or tacit dimension of human knowing. It is not necessary to repeat here all of the understandings in this reflection. Rather, let me reflect upon those understandings by bringing them together into a deeper level of human experience, by discussing a few crucial points that have given direction to my understanding of teacher competence.

We are losing humane language in our educational discourse.

All of us through the process of acculturation acquire a set of images of education, human being, and our world. But, these images are constituted by means of language. We think, do and live in our language. Language is the fundamental mode of operation of our being in the world. This is the point, as we saw in chapter III, in which

Heidegger calls language "the house of Being," and Gadamer claims the universality of language.

The use of a certain kind of language changes our mode of being in the world. For example, the use of industrial metaphors in educational discourse implies technical acumen on the part of the user. It affords educators the lure of effective production in education by means of technological language. The illusion of systematic control and prediction in education is legitimized in educational discourse by the technological language itself. Eventually, the use of such language changes the whole pattern of our educational discourse. Some educational words that do not lend themselves to the precision or criteria that the users of technological language value are de-emphasized, and gradually forced out of the educational discourse. What happens next is that such technological terms become ubiquitous, their images are taken for granted, they become a part of our way of educational life.

The point of my reflection is not only the fact that we are losing some kind of language by the dominance of technological rationality in education, but also the fact that, in my understanding, the language we are losing is a more genuine and humane one which has been cherished by people for a long time in educational discourse. Let me take an example from the curriculum texts. One of the texts says:

> The teacher's ability as a professional is more important than his or her attitude towards learners. Love is not enough for the teacher to be a professional. If a medical doctor makes erroneous

> diagnoses frequently, we cannot call him or her a professional doctor, regardless of his or her morality or love of patients. (The Foundations, p.276)

When we talk about professional ability rather than love, learners rather than children, performance rather than understanding, behavior rather than experience, instruction rather than teaching, response rather than action, the choice of language is not a mere matter of convenience or taste. It is a choice of a way of human life, a choice of a mode of being in the world. The consequences of the choice of such language and its image of education, in my understanding, are sterility and inhumanity. With the rationale of scientific objectivity, technological understanding of teacher competence deprives us of humane language in our educational discourse, and replaces it with inanimate language.

We are losing personal meanings in our educational experiences.

What does it mean to lose a particular kind of language in our discourse? Losing a certain kind of language means losing the meaning of the language, and in turn losing the human experience the language denotes. When we lose the word "love" in our educational discourse, we cannot expect any human experience of love in educational situations. The source of meanings in education or the source of meanings for persons engaged in education resides in the language we talk about educational phenomena. Huxley (1970) sees the

paradoxical character of language when he says:

> Every individual is at once the beneficiary and the victim of the linguistic tradition into which he has been born. The beneficiary in as much as language gives access to the accumulated records of other people's experience, the victim in so far as it confirms him in the belief that reduced awareness is the only awareness and as it bedevils his sense of reality so that he is all too apt to take his concepts for data, his words for actual things. (p.74)

The employment of empirical procedures that lend themselves to the lure of operational definitions and quantitative measurability has been one of the tenets of technological understanding. In our discussion of teacher competence, this means that the overt behaviors of the teacher are to be the primary referent for determining his or her competence as a teacher.

The analysis of human competence into measurable behavioral traits is a compelling illusion of technological rationality, an illusion of precision and objectivity, of a value-free image of pristine description, untouched by personal judgment, bias, or human failing. This lure or illusion of technological understanding, often regarded as a mark of scientific objectivity, leads us away from understanding the quality of personal lives that the teacher and students are experiencing in a pedagogical situation. The penchant of technological understanding for standardization hampers our understanding of what is truly unique about the persons who are engaged in education.

Today in the field of teacher education, we often hear the expression: "minimum competency testing for teachers."

Administering tests to determine whether teachers or teacher candidates have achieved a minimum level of competency is a recent fad. Competency testing emphasizes that prospective teachers must achieve above a pre-specified level on a standardized paper-pencil test as a prerequisite to certification. But, if a test "assigns levels as competent," as Hambleton and Eignor (1980, p.369) argue, "to those persons in the higher-scoring category and incompetent to those persons in the lower-scoring category," it is not competency testing, but competition testing. "Minimum competency testing" is nothing more than an expression of technological understanding; a standardization of teacher competence.

When we lose our personal meanings in schools, we are alienated from each other and from our own potential as human beings. This in turn fosters the dehumanization of our educational atmosphere. Macdonald (1975b) warns:

> Personal meanings when expressed or felt thus become anxiety laden and often result in guilt or shame reaction when not accepted or praised. As a result individuals engage in a "forgetfulness" concerning their own meanings.... When this happens the students have completed the personal-social connection by an accommodation to social alienation with the added dimension of becoming alienated not just from others or their work, but also alienated from their own personal potential through repressive "forgetfulness." (p.87)

If we really wish to understand the whole meaning of teacher competence, we must seek an empathetic understanding of the personal nature of lives which teachers and students lead in schools as Macdonald (1975b) suggests:

> If we are to understand the meaning of the schools we must search for the social meaning of the human activity that takes place there; and if we wish to examine the meaning implications of schooling we must look at the personal activity of people in the schools. (p.85)

We are losing humanity in our human education.

As we have seen in the discussion of CBTE as well as in the interpretation of the curriculum texts, one of the conspicuous tendencies in technological understanding is to analyze and separate every phenomenon into segmented parts. Under the logic of behavioral objectives and systems analysis, everything is split into fragments in order to make inferences about its existence through the observation of manifest elements. In this rationality, a human being is separated into the fragments of observable behavioral characteristics.

Behaviorists may list literally hundreds of behavioral characteristics of a human being. But, the sum of the segmental characteristics, no matter how many items they identify, cannot constitute a human being. The human being which the technological image tries to make is a fabricated product of organic parts. When a human being is treated as a factual object for analysis, there is a danger of losing our inseparable humanity. Husserl (1970) sees a crisis of the loss of our genuine humanity in the positive sciences:

> It concerns not the scientific character of the sciences but rather what they, or what science in general, had meant and could mean for human existence. The exclusiveness with which the total

> world view of modern man, in the second half of the nineteenth century, let itself be determined by the positive sciences and be blinded by the prosperity they produced, meant an indifferent turning-away from the questions which are decisive for a genuine humanity. Merely fact-minded sciences make merely fact-minded people. (pp.5-6)

Another omen of the loss of humanity in technological understanding can be found from its ends-means rationality. In the interpretation of the curriculum texts, for example, we saw a clear sequence of ends and means; education serves as a means for societal needs, curriculum is considered as a means to achieve educational aims, teaching becomes a means to accomplish intended objectives, the validity of knowledge is judged by its utility as a means, and teacher competence is understood as a means to bring production into the student's learning outcomes.

This logic is highly instrumental. If we drive this logic further, it is not difficult to imagine that the human being is to be instrumentalized by the logic itself. Marcuse (1964) warns the instrumentalization of the human being by technological rationality:

> The incessant dynamic of technical progress has become permeated with political content, and the Logos of technics has been made into the Logos of continued servitude. The liberating force of technology -the instrumentalization of things- turns into a fetter of liberation; the instrumentalization of man. (p.159)

Here, too, we find a root of the much talked about dehumanization of man. The dehumanizing syndrome, whether it originates from human life-histories involving narcissism, infantile regression, and instinctual regression, from the

separation of labor from the product, or from the salient characteristics of industrial mass society, has become increasingly manifest in our society, and has significantly influenced our everyday lives.

I think the time has come for remaking, recovering and restoring what we have lost in our educational lives by technological understanding. Much of the remaking of our forgotten language, of the possible recovery of our personal meanings, and of the restoration of our lost humanity rests upon our endeavor to search for the meaning of our beings in the world. Man or woman, in order to be a human being, must be forever an explorer of both his or her inner and outer realities. To exist, humanly, is to go beyond what has been given, to challenge what has been taken for granted, to question what has previously been accepted. We are human beings because we have the capacity to transcend what we are to become something that we are not.

C. Re-questioning the Meaning of Teacher Competence

> That we are born and socialized into a particular culture of a particular society in a particular era is fact, one with which we do not have to wrestle until we experience some disjunction, some sense that something is wrong, between how we feel and the characteristics of accustomed milieu. (Sarason, 1981, p.174)

When we experience some sense that something is wrong, we usually shake our heads as if questioning its truth. This questioning, I think, is the beginning of our new understanding. Where there is no questioning, there can be

no understanding, and vice versa. Suppose that we are attending a lecture in a quite different area of our interest. If we cannot understand what the speaker says, we cannot ask any questions. Only those who can understand the lecture know what questions should be asked in the context of the lecture. In other words, understanding something means being able to question it, and the questioning in its turn requires of it new deeper understanding.

Being aware of what is wrong with the scientific-technological understanding at a deeper level inevitably requires making new senses of teacher competence in order to allow new questions emerge for further understanding. Greene (1974) believes our potentialities for doing this:

> Can we not, as persons committed to transcendence, engage ourselves with fellow learners to widen and diversify perspectives? Can we not stimulate within ourselves and those we come to love a fresh awareness of the questionable, of what must not be taken for granted any longer? Can we not begin beckoning insistently, challenging individuals to move beyond the domestic and oppressive, to surpass the everyday? (p.82)

Can we not become more aware of new senses in our understanding of the curriculum texts as to the meaning of teacher competence?

The teacher is a human being.

One of the fundamental reflections upon our understanding is that we have forgotten a simple fact that the teacher is a human being. The teacher is not a malleable and powerless servant but an intentional human being. S/he

is an individual person who is his or her own being. Because s/he is a human being, s/he thinks, feels, acts, loves, grieves, rages.... Most of all, s/he can make sense of his or her own world as a person by means of experiences and perspectives.

To talk about the personal reality of teachers, therefore, is to consider their lived lives and their pursuits of meaning in contexts that include a concern for the social dimension of teaching, for the strategic, and for the existentially unique. Greene (1973) writes:

> The teacher is not a missionary, not a museum guard; he is a human being trying to recapture some of his original perceptions, trying to identify himself, trying to see. He can only be present to his students as a human being engaged in searching and choosing, as someone who is willing to take the risk of new perspectives, as someone who cares. (p.297)

The teacher is frequently addressed in the technological discourse of education as if s/he had no life of his or her own, no body, and no inwardness when it describes the competent teacher as infinitely controllable person who is technically efficient and impervious to moods. The teacher is usually defined by the role s/he is expected to play in a classroom. A truism that the teacher is a human being is very frequently overlooked in technological understanding. When we reflect upon the discussion of the previous section, re-affirming the teacher as a human being is too crucial to be pointed out as Cunningham (1979) sees:

> Clearly there is a need for the recognition of teachers, not as things, but as beings. Things can be described, defined, fragmented, measured, controlled. Things do not change from within. Things

> can perform actions, but they do not experience. Beings, on the other hand, actively describe, define, seek wholeness, elude measurement, pursue freedom. Beings change and grow and experience. Things do. Beings not only do, but are. (p.18)

Once we recognize the teacher as a human being, teacher competence cannot be understood as a set of knowledge or skills the competent teacher has, that is, as a thing. Teacher competence does not exist independently of or external to the intentions and motives of the teacher as a human being. The competence of the teacher is not a set of belongings s/he possesses like his or her car; it is very much him/herself like his or her face. When we understand a teacher as a human being, teacher competence is naturally conceived "as a quality of a person or as a state of being" (Short, 1985, p.5).

Therefore, the competent teacher is competent not only because s/he has a good command of a repertoire of techniques in teaching but also because of his or her quality as a human being. van Manen (1984b) states this point clearly:

> And yet when we allow ourselves to reflect more thoughtfully on teacher life, we may come to the recognition of a more profound truth: that more important than what we do is how we are present to children. Competence does not only refer to objective abilities and skills; it more essentially refers to the quality from which the knowledge of how to act somehow springs. (p.142)

When we understand teacher competence as "a quality of being" of a teacher, the question we must ask is not something like "What kind of knowledge and skills are needed for teachers to be competent?" Rather, it must be something

like "What does it mean to be a human being?" or "What does it mean to be more fully human?" These are ontological questions, and may not be easily answered. But, does the difficulty of answering mean the worthlessness of our striving toward answering them?

Human being is the whole person.

The more we know about human being, the more we realize how impenetrable is the inseparability of human being. Pinar (Pinar and Grumet, 1976) speaks of the ontological wholeness of being:

> Ontological, and I am being stipulative here, means being, and being as the gestalt of physical, emotional and mental dimensions. One's ontological being is "more" than the totality of these aspects. (p.99)

One matter which has bothered us in the technological understanding of teacher competence is its inclination to separate and split both human being and the world into bits and parts. But, there is no such human being in reality who exists as separate parts. Nor does the world. Even the distinction between human being and the world seems artificial, since human being is part of the world. There is no knowledge apart from the knower, and equally no knowledge apart from something to be known. Knower and known, whole and parts are not opposite concepts, but reciprocal ones.

When we are concentrating our attention on the parts or particulars, it is difficult, if not impossible, to recognize the gestalt, the whole sense of human being. When

we are enthusiastic in identifying branches, it is easy to forget where we have originated from, i.e., the root of the branches. Focusing on the whole, we are subsidiarily aware of its parts, but not vice versa. Beittel (1984) emphasizes the importance of wholeness in our understanding:

> The wholeness we remember, the wholeness we bring back with us, the wholeness we discern when and only when we are experientially and qualitatively whole, reveals the Eden, the rose, of self-plus-culture as one, before the reversal of mind, the knowledge of good and evil, the separation of light from darkness, splits asunder that moving wholeness into fragments forgetful of their origin, like the faithless art critic who forgets that what he took apart to make a point was really done through an act of violence demanding reaffirmation or, at least, an apology. (p.106)

In recent times, we often hear slogans like "Education for the Whole Person" in the educational field. How can we help children to be "whole persons" with fragmentary behavioral objectives? How can a teacher who has only segmental behavioral traits educate children as "whole persons"? If the teacher, if anyone, is to be an example of a whole person to others, s/he must first be a whole person. Where the teacher is treated as less than a whole person, where the teacher competence is segmented into fragments of behavioral traits, we cannot expect there "education for the whole person."

Clearly, teacher competence cannot be understood with a single set of meanings. It cannot be conceived even as a whole of discrete parts of technical skills or performances. It implies a whole set of knowing, thinking, doing, and being of a teacher. If one believes that the fundamental

problem in teacher education can be solved with any single approach, it may be a mistake resulting in a simple solution to a complex problem. Something of the nature and meaning of teacher competence, I think, must be grasped not by designed experiments or quantitative measurements, but by understanding the lived experiences of the teacher as a whole being. It is not much different from other important aspects of human life such as love, faith, or truth.

If we really want to understand the meaning of teacher competence, and to make a really important improvement in teacher education, we must pay attention to restoring the wholeness of the being of the teacher. Yet, are we to make no distinctions between parts and whole? Does a close and dialectical relationship mean identity? How can we understand the parts in the view of the whole?

Competence is communal venturing.

Our creation of a world is the result of an understanding of the reality we confront and the transformation of that reality. In an understanding, we find a meaning in reality through text, experience, discourse or whatever else, and that meaning again produces a transformation in reality through "the fusion of horizons." In other words, the human project is to transform oneself in the course of understanding reality. To ask a question of meaning, therefore, is to place ourselves in a continuing stream of self-reflective understanding.

The competent teacher, in my understanding, is a person who involves him or herself in this kind of continuing self-reflective thought, an endless exploration of the ways in which human beings come to know who they are, how they ought to believe, how they might behave, what they mean by the words they use, and the things they do. The competent teacher is a person who is self-consciously engaged in the commitments of observing, experiencing and making sense of human existence. S/he is the person who participates with others in the improvement of human conditions through the dialectical way of living; understanding and creation of meaning in the world. Gadamer (1984) understands participation as "enrichment by sharing":

> "Participation" is a strange word. Its dialectic consists of the fact that participation is not taking parts, but in a way taking the whole. Everybody who participates in something does not take something away, so that the others cannot have it. The opposite is true: by sharing, by our participating in the things in which we are participating, we enrich them; they do not become smaller, but larger. The whole life of tradition consists exactly in this enrichment: the whole inner store of our lives is always extending by participating. (p.64)

In attempting to re-understand the meaning of teacher competence, it may be helpful to explore the root etymology of "competence." The word comes from the Latin root "com-petere": "com" meaning "together," and "petere" meaning "to seek." In a root sense, then, "competence" means "to seek together" or "to venture forth together." The etymological origin of the word tells us clearly a view of competence as communal venturing for a progress in our lives

that always must be renewed by our endless efforts. In this sense, Aoki (1984a) helps our understanding by seeing competence in teaching as "critical venturing together":

> Competence as critical venturing together, then, with its interests in liberating man from hidden assumptions and techniques, promotes a theory of man and society that is grounded in the moral attitude of liberation. (p.77)

Understanding competence as "communal venturing" can also be revealed from the ontological nature of human being: human openness to being; not merely to knowing and choosing things, but to becoming by his or her own acts what s/he is to be. A human being is a person-to-be-achieved. S/he is not a static thing, but an active individual, not merely evolving but developing him/herself by actively participating in the world with other beings.

We know more about human being today than ever before, yet never has human being appeared so mysterious as now. Who is s/he?

> The Delphic demand "Know thyself" meant, "Know that you are a man and no god." It holds true as well for human beings in the age of the science, for it stands as a warning before all illusions of mastery and domination. (Gadamer, 1981, p.150)

D. Reflections on the Personal Experience of Understanding

(1) As I recollect my thoughts and actions over the past three years in my doctoral program, especially the one and half years in the writing of this research, I have become aware of my struggle to transform myself. This research emerged from my experiences as a teacher educator.

Feeling that something was wrong with what I was doing led me to a doctoral study, and made me struggle with this research. Why have I chosen this struggle rather than to live easily in a taken-for-granted world? Well, because I am a human creature as Karl Jaspers says:

> We are creatures of this sort, and we are lost if we relinquish our orientation to the dry land. But we are not content to remain there. That is why our flutterings are so uncertain and perhaps so absurd to those who sit secure and content on dry land, and are intelligible only to those who have been seized by the same unrest. For them the world is a point of departure for that flight upon which everything depends, which each man must venture on his own though in common with other men, and which can never become the object of any doctrine. (cited in Abbs, 1979, p.89)

(2) What was it like for me to do this research? What was it like to venture forth to understand the meaning of teacher competence? I already used the term "struggle." It was not a struggle against other people, but myself. It was not a struggle to get something, but to become who I am not. When the wastebasket under my desk was filled with crumpled sheets of paper everyday, when I threw a whole draft of a chapter into the wastebasket, it was not that I had certain external criteria for judging my research. It was a struggle with my own expectations of who I am. It was much like a pupa's struggle to become a butterfly, a struggle which only that pupa can undertake?

> The butterfly is a beautiful and active creature. In its process of metamorphosis, it emerges from the pupa. It puts up a tremendous struggle to break out of its chitinous shell. A nature lover, once noticing this, thought that creature should be saved the struggle. With great dexterity, he used a scalpel to cut away the shell. Then the butterfly

> emerged without a struggle. But it was lame; it could not fly... (source unknown)

(3) What was it like for me to do a hermeneutical research? What is the difference between talking about hermeneutical understanding and actually doing it? In this study, I have tried to do both -talking about hermeneutical understanding based on Gadamer in chapter III, and actually doing it with teacher education curriculum texts in chapter V. How do I understand the relationship of the two chapters?

Originally when I planned chapter III, I expected that the chapter might give me a methodical framework or guide for doing chapter V. But, unfortunately (or fortunately?), the expectation could hardly be met. Rather, I have come to realize, through my experience of doing chapter V, that hermeneutical theory is not a guide for method but a guide for reflection, that is, our understanding. I have felt that doing chapter V was heavily dependent upon my understanding of hermeneutics rather than following certain rules for doing something.

Doing chapter V for me was not like an application of a theory to a practical situation in an instrumental sense. What I had to do in chapter V was rather to examine a theory itself or create an educational theory based on my own understanding. It was an experience of "theorizing" in the sense that Aoki (1981) speaks of it:

> Educators in re-thinking education (i.e., in theorizing about education) must liberate themselves from both objectivistic and subjectivistic traditions, and must engage themselves in a deeper and fuller understanding of the concrete lived

> experiences that reveal what it is like to educate, as well as what it is like to be educated. (p.36)

I could observe myself, through the writing and re-writing of the chapters, experiencing an act of understanding; a systematic and critical reflection upon practice. I could observe myself becoming aware of my correct but not yet true beliefs, and through the awareness having a fresh look at the question of teacher competence. After finishing chapter five, I read Gadamer (1981) again:

> Practice consists of choosing, of deciding for something and against something else, and in doing this a practical reflection is effective, which is itself dialectical in the highest measure.... Practice, then, certainly does not rely solely upon an abstract consciousness of norms. It is always concretely motivated already, prejudiced to be sure, but also challenged to a critique of prejudices. (pp.81-2)

(4) What are the results of my struggle for understanding? What products has this research brought? Probably, "nothing." When a Zen master reaches a state of *vimukti* (Buddhistic emancipation) through a meditation, i.e., a struggle to become what he (human being) really is, the state of *vimukti* is usually described as "nothing-ness." If a technologically-minded person asks him to show the result of the meditation, there may be no other way for him than to say "no-thing."

But, the struggle has revealed to me an important sense of "nothing-ness" from my experience: "no ending-ness" of our understanding. Experiencing an understanding for me was becoming aware of the finitude of my understanding. As I found myself in the flow of the study, I became aware of the

need to forgo certainty in terms of fixed and final answers to the initial questions raised in the introductory chapter. In the process, I became freer myself from the expectations that I had to have clear research findings and that I had to arrive at any final meaning of teacher competence.

Hermeneutical understanding, as self-understanding, is always on-the-way; it is on a path whose completion is a clear impossibility. Hermeneutical experience is experience of human finitude as Gadamer (1975) understands it:

> Thus experience is experience of human finitude. The truly experienced man is one who is aware of this, who knows that he is master neither of time nor the future. The experienced man knows the limitedness of all prediction and the uncertainty of all plans. In him is realised the truth-value of experience. If it is characteristic of every phase of the process of experience that the experienced person acquires a new openness to new experiences, that is certainly true of the idea of complete experience. (p.320)

Therefore, my inquiry into the meaning of teacher competence cannot be finished. It is, "TO BE CONTINUED."

E. Inconclusive Conclusion: Teacher or Educator?

Huebner (1975c) raises an interesting distinction between "teacher" and "educator" based on his own experience:

> I soon discovered that helping an individual realize his or her own possibilities sometimes came in conflict with maintaining the order and routines of a classroom and school. The fact that I had to fulfill my intention of being an educator by being a school functionary did not strike me as being unrealistic. The distinction between being an educator and being a school teacher was not transparent to me at that time, nor to most educators. Today it is. (p.28)

With the above statement, it is not difficult to infer what he intends to say by the distinction between "teacher" and "educator." A "teacher" may be the person who teaches students in order to meet certain objectives, or to maximize certain values in the behavior of the students. The main role of the "teacher" is to manipulate materials, environment and even students so that the intended effects are achieved and can be measured. An "educator," on the other hand, could be conceived as a person who "helps individuals be more self-fulfilling, more powerful, more capable of recognizing and realizing their own possibilities as human beings" (Ibid, p.27). The term "teacher" goes well with the "maintenance functions" of the school, while "educator" with "educational functions."

In Korean too, as we saw somewhere in an earlier chapter, a similar distinction can be found between "教師 (kyo-sa)" and " 스승 (su-sung)." The term "kyo-sa" does not convey any special feeling. It simply means a person who has a teaching job just like "teach-er" in English. A "kyo-sa" is conceived as nothing more than a member of school functionaries. This term is used widely in laws and regulations as well as in teacher education textbooks. On the other hand, the word "su-sung" involves in itself a strong sense of good or great teacher. There can be a bad "kyo-sa," but not bad "su-sung." I have had many "kyo-sa" in my life, but only few "su-sung." They are the persons who have entered deeply into my life, who have shared their

personhood with me, who have struggled to give me the questions in life rather than to provide the answers, who have allowed me to think of a truly human way of being, together in the world susceptible to questioning.

As teacher educators, we must ask: Do we want to train our students as "teachers" ("kyo-sa")? Or do we want to educate them as "educators" ("su-sung")? If we really want to do the latter, we teacher educators need the same kind of awareness that we ask of our students. We teacher educators too must be willing to see ourselves as "educators" ("su-sung"), to be willing to help our students be "educators" ("su-sung").

Following my doctoral program, I will return to my classroom, to being a teacher educator, with more questions to be pursued than ever before starting my doctoral studies.

> I return to the classroom, for I have projected myself into the world as a being who is called teacher. Yes, I am a called teacher. In that projection I called, from the mysterious depths of my being, on the world, and the world called on me to be. I have responded to the call in choosing that mode of being called teaching. That is quite literally a calling, a vocation. That call, however, imposes neither substantialist nor functionalistic definition on me; rather, that call, and my response to it in choice, constitute a hole of possibility, a hole bounded by the arc of my intentionality, a hole both bright and mysterious. (Denton, 1974, p.114)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abbs, Peter. Reclamations: Essays on Culture, Mass-Culture and the Curriculum. London: Heinemann Educational Books, 1979.

Aoki, Ted T. "Toward Curriculum Inquiry in a New Key." Occasional Paper 2, Department of Secondary Education, The University of Alberta, 1980.

Aoki, Ted T. "To the Concrete Itself in Studies in Education: A Response." In Ted T. Aoki, ed. Re-Thinking Education: Modes of Enquiry in the Human Sciences. Monograph No.3, Department of Secondary Education, The University of Alberta, 1981.

Aoki, Ted T. "Competence in Teaching as Instrumental and Practical Action: A Critical Analysis." In Edmund C. Short, ed., Competence, 1984a, pp.71-79.

Aoki, Ted T. "Toward a Reconceptualization of Curriculum Implimentation." In David Hopkins and Marvin Wideen, ed. Alternative Perspectives on School Improvement. Philadelphia: The Falmer Press, 1984b, pp.107-118.

Beauchamp, George A. Curriculum Theory. 2nd ed. Wilmette: The Kag Press, 1968.

Beittel, Kenneth R. "Great Swamp Fires I Have Known: Competence and the Hermeneutics of Qualitative Experiencing." In Edmund C. Short, ed. Competence. 1984, pp.105-121.

Berger, Peter, Brigitte Berger and Hansfried Kellner. The Homeless Mind: Modernization and Consciousness. New York: Random House, 1973.

Bernstein, Richard J. "From Hermeneutics to Praxis." The Review of Metaphysics. 35(4), Issue No. 140, June 1982, pp.823-845.

Bernstein, Richard J. Beyond Objectivism and Relativism: Science, Hermeneutics, and Praxis. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1983.

Bleicher, Josef. Contemporary hermeneutics: Hermeneutics as method, philosophy and critique. London: Routledge & Kagan Paul, 1980.

Bloom, Benjamin S. Taxonomy of Educational Objectives.

Handbook I: Cognitive Domain. New York: David McKay, 1956.

Bobbitt, Franklin. The Curriculum. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1918.

Bobbitt, Franklin. How to Make a Curriculum. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1924.

Borrowman, Merle L. The Liberal and Technical in Teacher Education: A Historical Survey of American Thought. New York: Teachers College Press, 1956.

Borrowman, Merle L., ed. Teacher Education in America: A Documentary History. New York: Teachers College Press, 1965.

Bowers, C.A. "The Reproduction of Technological Consciousness: Locating the Ideological Foundations of a Radical Pedagogy." Teachers College Record, 83(4), 1982, pp.529-557.

Bredo, Eric and Walter Feinberg, ed. Knowledge and Values in Social and Educational Research. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1982.

Broudy, Harry S. A Critique of Performance-Based Teacher Education. Washington, D.C.: AACTE, 1972.

Broudy, Harry S. "The University and the Preparation of Teachers." In Lilian G. Katz and James D. Raths, ed., Advances in Teacher Education. Vol. 1. Norwood: Ablex, 1984, pp.1-8.

Bruner, Jerome S. The Process of Education. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1960.

Bruner, Jerome S. "The Process of Education Revisited." Phi Delta Kappan, September, 1971, pp.18-21.

Buber, Martin. Between Man and Man. Trans. Ronald Gregor Smith. New York: Macmillan, 1965.

Burns, Richard W. "The Central Notion: Explicit Objectives." In W. Robert Houston and Robert B. Howsam, ed., Competency-Based Teacher Education. 1972, pp.17-33.

Callahan, Raymond E. Education and the Cult of Efficiency. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962.

Carson, Terrance R. "Conversations with Participants about Curriculum Implementation." Paper presented at the annual AERA conference, Montreal, Canada, 1983.

Castle, Edgar Bradshaw. The Teacher. London: Oxford University Press, 1970.

Combs, Arthur W. et al. The Professional Education of Teachers: A Humanistic Approach to Teacher Education. 2nd ed. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1978.

Conant, James B. The Education of Americal Teachers. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1963.

Cunningham, Beverley A. "Teaching as Being: The Right to Personhood." Occasional Paper No.6. Department of Secondary Education, The University of Alberta, 1979.

Dallmayr, Fred R. and Thomas A. McCarthy, ed. Understanding and Social Inquiry. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1977.

Denton, David E. "That Mode of Being Called Teaching." In David E. Denton, ed., Existentialism and Phenomenology. New York: Teachers College Press, 1974, pp.99-115.

Eggleston, John. The Sociology of the School Curriculum. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1977.

Eisner, Elliot W. "The Art and Craft of Teaching." Educational Leadership, 40(4), 1983, pp.4-13.

Eisner, Elliot W. The Educational Imagination. 2nd ed. New York: Macmillan, 1985.

Ermarth, Michael. Wilhelm Dilthey: The Critique of Historical Reason. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1978.

Finkelstein, Barbara. "Technicians, Mandarins, and Witnesses: Searching for Professional Understanding." Journal of Teacher Education, 33(3), 1982, pp.25-27.

Gadamer, Hans-Georg. Truth and Method. New York: Crossroad, 1975a.

Gadamer, Hans-Georg. "Hermeneutics and Social Sciences." Cultural Hermeneutics, 2(4), 1975b, pp.307-316.

Gadamer, Hans-Georg. Philosophical Hermeneutics. Trans. and ed. by David E. Linge. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1976a.

Gadamer, Hans-Georg. Hegel's Dialectic: Five Hermeneutical Studies. Trans. by P. Christopher Smith. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1976b.

Gadamer, Hans-Georg. "The Problem of Historical

Consciousness." In Paul Rabinow and William Sullivan, ed., Interpretive Social Science: A Reader. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1979, pp.103-160.

Gadamer, Hans-Georg. Dialogue and Dialectic: Eight Hermeneutical Studies on Plato. Trans. by P. Christopher Smith. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1980.

Gadamer, Hans-Georg. Reason in the Age of Science. Trans. by Frederick G. Lawrence. Cambridge: The MIT Press, 1981.

Gadamer, Hans-Georg. "The Hermeneutics of Suspicion." In Gary Shapiro and Alan Sica, ed., Hermeneutics: Questions and Prospects. Amherst: The University of Massachusetts Press, 1984, pp.54-65.

Gage, Nathaniel L. The Scientific Basis of the Art of Teaching. New York: Teachers College Press, 1978.

Gamson, Zelda F. and Associates. Liberating Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1984.

Giroux, Henry A. "Teacher Education and the Ideology of Social Control." Journal of Education, 162(1), 1980, pp.5-27.

Giroux, Henry A., Anthony N. Penna and William F. Pinar, ed. Curriculum & Instruction: Alternatives in Education. Berkeley: McCutchan, 1981.

Grant, Gerald et al. On Competence: A Critical Analysis of Competence-Based Reform in Higher Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1979.

Greene, Maxine. Teacher as Stranger: Educational Philosophy for the Modern Age. Belmont: Wadsworth, 1973.

Greene, Maxine. "Cognition, Consciousness, and Curriculum." In William F. Pinar, ed., Heightened Consciousness, Cultural Revolution, and Curriculum Theory. Berkeley; McCutchan, 1974, pp.69-84.

Greene, Maxine. "Choice versus Performance: An Existential Look at PBTE." In Ralph A. Smith, ed., Regaining Educational Leadership. 1975, pp.202-211.

Greene, Maxine. Landscapes of Learning. New York: Teachers College Press, 1978.

Grumet, Madeleine R. "Curriculum as Theater: Merely Players." Curriculum Inquiry, 8(1), 1978, pp.37-64.

Grumet, Madeleine R. "Songs and Situations: The Figure/Ground Relation in a Case Study of Currere." In

George Willis, ed., Qualitative Evaluation. 1978b, pp.274-315.

Habermas, Jürgen. Knowledge and Human Interests. Boston: Beacon Press, 1971.

Habermas, Jürgen. "A Review of Gadamer's Truth and Method." In Fred Dallmayr and Thomas McCarthy, ed., Understanding and Social Inquiry. 1977, pp.335-363.

Habermas, Jürgen. The Theory of Communicative Action: Reason and the Rationalization of Society. Trans. by Thomas McCarthy. Boston: Beacon Press, 1984.

Hambleton, Ronald K. and Daniel R. Eignor. "Competency Test Development, Validation, and Standard Setting." In Richard M. Jaeger and Carol Kehr Tittle, ed., Minimum Competency Achievement Testing: Motives, Models, Measures, and Consequences. 1980, pp.367-396.

Heidegger, Martin. Being and Time. Trans. by John Macquarrie and Edward Robinson. New York: Harper & Row, 1962.

Heidegger, Martin. The Question Concerning Technology. Trans. by William Lovitt. New York: Harper & Row, 1977.

Heidegger, Martin. Basic Writings. Ed. by David Farrell Krell. New York: Harper & Row, 1977b.

Houston, W. Robert, ed. Exploring Competency Based Education. Berkeley: McCutchan, 1974.

Houston, W. Robert and Robert B. Howsam, ed. Competency-Based Teacher Education: Progress, Problems, and Prospects. Chicago: Science Research Associates, 1972.

Howard, Roy J. Three Faces of Hermeneutics: An Introduction to Current Theories of Understanding. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1982.

Hoy, David Couzens. The Critical Circle: Literature, History, and Philosophical Hermeneutics. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1978.

Hoy, David Couzens. "Hermeneutics." Social Research. 47(4), 1980, pp.649-671.

Huebner, Dwayne. "The Tasks of the Curricular Theorist." In William F. Pinar, ed., Curriculum Theorizing. 1975a, pp.250-270.

Huebner, Dwayne. "Curricular Language and Classroom Meanings." In William F. Pinar, ed., Curriculum

Theorizing. 1975b, pp.217-236.

Huebner, Dwayne. "The Contradiction Between the Recreative and the Established." In James B. Macdonald and Esther Zaret, ed., Schools in Search of Meaning. 1975c, pp.27-37.

Husserl, Edmund. The Crisis of European Science and Transcendental Phenomenology. Trans. by David Carr. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1970.

Huxley, Aldous. The Doors of Perception. New York: Harper & Row, 1970.

Ihde, Don. Technics and Praxis. Boston: D. Reidel Pub., 1979.

Ihde, Don. Existential Technics. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1983.

Jaeger, Richard M. and Carol Kehr Tittle, ed. Minimum Competency Achievement Testing: Motives, Models, Measures, and Consequences. Berkeley: McCutchan, 1980.

Johnson, Henry C. "Not One 'Unnecessary Wriggle:' Some Questions about the Presuppositions of C/PBTE." Educational Theory. 25(2), 1975, pp.156-167.

Johnson, Henry C. "The Quest for the 'Competent' Teacher: An Historical Exploration of the Managerial Matrix and the Behaviorist Connection." In Edmund C. Short, ed., Competence. 1984, pp.41-69.

Johnson, Mauritz. "Definitions and Models in Curriculum Theory." In Henry A. Giroux, Anthony H. Penna and William F. Pinar, ed., Curriculum and Instruction. 1981, pp.69-85.

Kliebard, Herbert M. "The Question in Teacher Education." In Donald J. McCarty and Associates, ed., New Perspectives on Teacher Education. 1973, pp.8-24.

Kliebard, Herbert M. "Reappraisal: The Tyler Rationale." In William F. Pinar, ed., Curriculum Theorizing. 1975a, pp.70-83.

Kliebard, Herbert M. "Persistent Issues in Curriculum Theorizing." In William F. Pinar, ed., Curriculum Theorizing. 1975b, pp.39-50.

Kliebard, Herbert M. "The Rise of Scientific Curriculum Making and Its Aftermath." Curriculum Theory Network. 5(1), 1975c, pp.27-38.

Kuhn, Thomas S. The Structure of Scientific Revolutions. 2nd ed. Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1970(1962).

Kvale, Steiner. "The Qualitative Research Interview: A Phenomenological and Hermeneutical Mode of Understanding." Journal of Phenomenological Psychology. 14(2), 1984, pp.171-196.

Langer, Susanne K. Philosophy in a New Key. New York: New American Library, 1954.

Lapp, Diane, et al. Teaching and Learning: Philosophical, Psychological, Curricular Applications. New York: Macmillan, 1975.

Lawn, Martin and Len Barton, ed. Rethinking Curriculum Studies: A Radical Approach. London: Croom Helm, 1981.

Lawton, Denis. The Politics of the School Curriculum. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1980.

Lawton, Denis. Curriculum Studies and Educational Planning. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1983.

Levit, Martin. "The Ideology of Accountability in Schooling." In Ralph A. Smith, ed., Regaining Educational Leadership. 1975, pp.122-134.

Lucas, Christopher J. Foundations of Education: Schooling and the Social Order. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1984.

McCarthy, Donald J. and Associates, ed. New Perspectives on Teacher Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973.

Macdonald, James B. "Curriculum Theory." In William F. Pinar, ed., Curriculum Theorizing. 1975a, pp.5-13.

Macdonald, James B. "The Quality of Everyday Life in School." In James B. Macdonald and Esther Zaret, ed., Schools in Search of Meaning. 1975b, pp.78-94.

Macdonald, James B. "Theory-Practice and the Hermeneutical Circle." Journal of Curriculum Theorizing. 3(2), Summer 1981, pp.130-138.

Macdonald, James B. and Esther Zaret, ed. Schools in Search of Meaning. Washington, D.C.: ASCD, 1975.

Mager, Robert F. Preparing Instructional Objectives. Palo Alto: Fearon Pub., 1962.

Makkreel, Rudolf. Dilthey: Philosopher of the Human Studies. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1975.

Marcuse, Herbert. One-Dimensional Man. Boston: Beacon Press, 1964.

McDonald, Frederick J. "The Rationale for Competency Based Programs." In W. Robert Houston, ed., Exploring Competency Based Education. 1974, pp.17-30.

Medley, Donald M. Teacher Competence and Teacher Effectiveness: A Review of Process-Product Research. Washington, D.C.: AACTE, 1977.

Medley, Donald M. "Teacher Competency testing and the Teacher Educator." In Lilian G. Katz and James D. Raths, ed., Advances in Teacher Education. Norwood: Ablex, 1984, pp.51-94.

Merleau-Ponty, M. Phenomenology of Perception. Trans. by Colin Smith. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1962.

Molnar, Alex and John A. Zahorik, ed. Curriculum Theory. Washington, D.C.: ASCD, 1977.

Palermo, James. "Pedagogy as a Critical Hermeneutics." Cultural Hermeneutics. 3, 1975, pp.137-146.

Palmer, Richard E. Hermeneutics. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1969.

Pinar, William F., ed. heightened consciousness, cultural revolution, and curriculum theory. Berkeley: McCutchan, 1974.

Pinar, William F., ed. Curriculum Theorizing: The Reconceptualists. Berkeley: McCutchan, 1975a.

Pinar, William F. "Currere: Toward Reconceptualization." In William F. Pinar, ed., Curriculum Theorizing. 1975b, pp.396-414.

Pinar, William F. and Madeleine R. Grumet. Toward a Poor Curriculum. Dubuque: Kendall/Hunt, 1976.

Pinar, William F. and Madeleine R. Grumet. "Theory and Practice and the Reconceptualisation of Curriculum Studies." In Martin Lawn and Len Barton, ed., Rethinking Curriculum Studies. 1981, pp.20-42.

Piper, Martha K. and Robert W. Houston. "The Search for Teacher Competence: CBTE and MCT." Journal of Teacher Education. 31(5), 1980. pp.37-39.

Plantinga, Theodore. Historical Understanding in the Thought of Wilhelm Dilthey. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1980.

Polanyi, Michael. Personal Knowledge: Toward a Post-Critical Philosophy. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1958.

Polanyi, Michael. "Understanding Ourselves." In Robert Ornstein, ed., The Nature of Human Consciousness. San Francisco: Freeman, 1968.

Popkewitz, Thomas S. "Paradigms in Educational Science: Different Meanings and Purpose to Theory." Journal of Education. 162(1), Winter 1980, pp. 28-46.

Rabinow, Paul and William Sullivan, ed. Interpretive Social Science: A Reader. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1979.

Ricoeur, Paul. "Ethics and Culture: Habermas and Gadamer in Dialogue." Philosophy Today. 17(2,4), 1973, pp. 153-165.

Ricoeur, Paul. The Conflict of Interpretation: Essays in Hermeneutics. Ed. by Don Ihde. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1974.

Ricoeur, Paul. Interpretation Theory: Discourse and the Surplus of Meaning. Fort Worth: The Texas Christian University Press, 1976.

Ricoeur, Paul. Hermeneutics and the Human Sciences. Ed. by John B. Thompson. London: Cambridge University Press, 1981.

Sarason, Seymour B. Psychology Misdirected. New York: The Free Press, 1981.

Saylor, J. Galen. "Antecedent Developments in the Movement to Performance-Based Programs ~~of~~ Teacher Education." Working Document for AACTE. Lincoln: The Land Center, 1976.

Seung, T.K. Structuralism and Hermeneutics. New York: Columbia University Press, 1982.

Shapiro, Gary and Alan Sica, ed., Hermeneutics: Questions and Prospects. Amherst: The University of Massachusetts Press, 1984.

Short, Edmund C., ed. Competence: Inquiries into Its Meaning and Acquisition in Educational Settings. Lanham: University Press of America, 1984.

Short, Edmund C. "The Concept of Competence: Its Use and Misuse in Education." Journal of Teacher Education. March-April, 1985, pp.2-6.

Skinner, B.F. The Technology of Teaching. New York: Appleton, 1968.

Skinner, B.F. Beyond Freedom & Dignity. New York: Bantam Books, 1971.

Smith, Ralph A., ed. Regaining Educational Leadership: Critical Essays on PBTE/CBTE, Behavioral Objectives and Accountability. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1975.

Smith, Ralph A. "Introduction: Educational Criticism and the PPBS Movement in Education." In Ralph A. Smith, ed., Regaining Educational Leadership. 1975, pp.1-14.

Taba, Hilda. Curriculum Development. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1962.

Tanner, Daniel and Laurel J. Tanner. Curriculum Development: Theory into Practice. 2nd ed. New York: Macmillan, 1980.

Thiselton, Anthony C. The Two Horizons: New Testament Hermeneutics and Philosophical Description with Special Reference to Heidegger, Bultmann, Gadamer, and Wittgenstein. Exeter: The Paternoster Press, 1980.

Thompson, John B. Critical Hermeneutics: A Study in the Thought of Paul Ricoeur and Jürgen Habermas. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981.

Tom, Alan R. "Critique of Performance Based Teacher Education." The Educational Forum. 17(1), 1977, pp.77-87.

Tyler, Ralph. Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1949.

van Manen, Max. "Phenomenological Pedagogy." Curriculum Inquiry. 12(3), 1982, pp.283-299.

van Manen, Max. "Practicing Phenomenological Writing." Phenomenology and Pedagogy. 2(1), 1984a, pp.36-69.

van Manen, Max. "Reflections on Teacher Competence and Pedagogic Competence." In Edmund C. Short, ed., Competence. 1984b, pp.141-158.

Waks, Leonard J. "Educational Objectives and Existential Heroes." In Ralph A. Smith, ed., Regaining Educational Leadership. 1975, pp.87-103.

Watts, Doyle. "The Humanistic Approach to Teacher Education: A Giant Step Backwards?" Educational Leadership. 36(2), 1978, pp.87-90.

Weinsheimer, Joel C. Gadamer's Hermeneutics: A Reading of Truth and Method. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985.

Weizenbaum, Joseph. Computer Power and Human Reason. New York: W.H. Freeman and Company, 1976.

Willis, George, ed. Qualitative Evaluation: Concepts and Cases in Curriculum Criticism. Berkeley: McCutchan, 1978.

Wilson, John. Educational Theory and the Preparation of Teachers. London: NFER, 1975.

Wynn, Dale Richard. Careers in Teaching. New York: McGraw-Hill Book, 1960.

Zeichner, Kenneth M. "Alternative Paradigms of Teacher Education." Journal of Teacher Education. 34(3) May-June, 1983, pp.3-9.